

**County of Loudoun**  
**Department of Planning**  
**MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** May 18, 2006

**TO:** THE LOUDOUN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

**FROM:** Cindy Keegan, AICP, Project Manager *Keegan*  
CPAM 2005-0003, Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the  
Upper Broad Run and Upper Foley Subareas

**SUBJECT:** Information for May 22, 2006 Planning Commission Worksession

At the May 8, 2006 Planning Commission Worksession on CPAM 2005-0003, Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the Upper Broad Run and Upper Foley Subareas, the Commission reviewed the draft questions raised at the October 3, 2005 Public Hearing related to transportation, fiscal impact, economic impact, by-right development, and other. Staff has received one public comment since the last work session (Attachment B). The following information is being provided in preparation for the upcoming Worksession:

**Attachment A:** Responses to Planning Commission Questions

**Attachment B:** Public Input received from Greenvest LLC, May 18, 2006 (*PC only*)

## **RESPONSES TO PLANNING COMMISSION QUESTIONS**

**May 22, 2006**

### ***Transportation***

***The following questions will be addressed at the May 22, 2006 Planning Commission Worksession.***

1. What kind of time is needed to conduct a full gravity transportation analysis of the Route 50 corridor assuming interchanges along the corridor?
2. Provide copies of recent traffic studies for current rezoning applications.
3. What is the amount of money that has been spent on roads and roads per capita?
4. What has been the transportation impact of increased population due to large rezonings? What are the current plans and monies allocated for projects along the 50 corridor (i.e. 50 and the connector roads) and what could the County expect in proffers if one or more of the proposed rezoning were approved? What is the impact on the traffic with road improvements? Provide a map of by-right and proffered communities and proffer commitments.

### ***Fiscal Impact***

1. How much has the County spent per capita and by population, on education and dollars per student in 5-year increments since 1980 and in 1-year increments since the year 2000?

***See Attachment 1, pg. A-1.***

2. Looking at the overall Countywide budget, how is the budget allocated by Departments, e.g., County Administration, Sheriff's Department, School Board, Health Services, etc?

***See Attachment 2, pg. A-15.***

3. Over the last 25 years, how has the level of services increased for County residents? Have expectations for level of services increased?

***This type of analysis has not been conducted by the County. Additional time and resources are required to conduct this analysis.***

4. Using current year dollars, how much has the County spent per student, per school since the year 2000 in 1-year increments?

***See Attachment 1, pg. A-1.***

### ***Economic Impact***

1. What impacts have large rezonings (e.g., Ashburn Village, Broadlands, South Riding) had on tax rates and dollars per thousand in assessments in 5-year increments starting in 1980?

***This type of analysis has not been conducted by the County. Additional time and resources are required to conduct this analysis.***

2. What economic conditions and/or factors have influenced level of services expenditures the last 25 years?

***This type of analysis has not been conducted by the County. Additional time and resources are required to conduct this analysis.***

### ***By-right Development***

1. Provide a list of the by-right communities and proffered communities that have been built in the Dulles South area since 1985.

***See Attachment 3, pg. A-17.***

2. Provide an overview of the Lenah Run and The Marches subdivisions to include site plans and special features and highlights of the developments.

***See Attachment 4, pg. A-23.***

### ***Other***

1. Information and/or request to provide recent studies associated with farm pollution.

***See Attachment 5, pg. A-27.***

2. Why and how the proposed George Mason University Loudoun County campus has come about? What excited the University about the proposed site in Loudoun?

***See Attachment 6, pg. A-35.***

3. Provide a review of the 1992 DSAMP memo regarding Capital Facilities Needs Assessment (provided during the public comment). To include a discussion of the projections and major features in light of what has actually occurred. That is, what was expected to happen in the area back in 1992 and what has actually happened today. Highlight any major shifts that have occurred since 1992.

***See Attachment 7, pg. A-36.***

# HISTORICAL TABLES: BUDGET TRENDS Fiscal Years 1996 - 2007

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>PAGE</u>	
1	Table 1.--General Fund Operating Adopted Budget Expenditures (Adjusted for Inflation)
2	Table 2.--General Fund Operating Adopted Budget Expenditure Detail (Adjusted for Inflation)
3	Table 3.--General Fund Operating Adopted Budget Expenditures (Not Adjusted for Inflation)
4	Table 4.--General Fund Operating Adopted Budget Expenditure Detail (Not Adjusted for Inflation)
5	Tables 5A & 5B.--General Fund Transfer to School Fund Adopted Expenditures (Not Adjusted & Adjusted for Inflation)
6	Table 6.--General Fund and School Fund Adopted Expenditures (Not Adjusted for Inflation)
7	Table 7.--General Fund and School Fund Adopted Expenditures (Adjusted for Inflation)
8	Table 8.--Debt Service Fund Adopted Expenditures (Not Adjusted for Inflation)
9	Table 9.--Debt Service Fund Adopted Expenditures (Adjusted for Inflation)
10	Table 10.--General Government and School System Combined Adopted Expenditures (Not Adjusted for Inflation)
11	Table 11.--General Government and School System Combined Adopted Expenditures (Adjusted for Inflation)
12	Table 12.--General Fund and School Fund FTE Counts

Table 1.--FY 96 Adopted -FY 07 Proposed General Fund Operating Expenditures  
Adjusted for Inflation  
(amounts in FY 07 constant dollars) 1/

Expenditures:	Adopted FY 96	Adopted FY 97	Adopted FY 98	Adopted FY 99	Adopted FY 00	Adopted FY 01	Adopted FY 02	Adopted FY 03	Adopted FY 04	Adopted FY 05	Adopted FY 06	Proposed FY 07
Personnel.....	75,185,538	79,173,803	88,538,543	88,370,912	97,283,465	119,150,406	149,410,987	150,496,953	162,421,969	174,187,355	186,777,070	208,721,294
Operations and Maintenance.....	38,704,125	42,888,379	42,788,529	47,583,966	50,196,819	62,342,748	87,277,734	83,846,636	76,906,878	76,494,040	85,038,585	94,552,191
Capital Outlay and Acquisition.....	911,570	2,074,594	2,402,797	2,585,645	4,196,349	5,317,172	9,930,187	4,541,491	3,399,739	3,450,062	5,422,401	6,542,891
Contingencies, Debt Service and Other.....	502,789	449,500	228,052	223,314	1,575,539	3,253,971	204,036	1,134,078	4,413,043	2,848,828	1,542,206	1,500,000
Total Expenditures.....	115,304,022	124,586,275	133,977,921	138,763,837	153,252,173	190,064,297	246,822,944	240,019,158	247,141,630	256,980,285	278,780,262	311,316,376
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	8.1%	7.8%	6.4%	7.4%	10.5%	13.5%	11.0%	10.0%	9.3%	9.2%	9.4%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	8.1%	7.5%	3.6%	10.4%	24.0%	29.9%	-2.8%	3.0%	4.0%	8.5%	11.7%
Expenditures per Capita:												
Personnel.....	618.32	598.22	624.73	565.13	573.61	643.64	761.08	712.76	707.94	704.38	710.08	748.70
Operations and Maintenance.....	318.30	324.06	301.85	304.30	295.97	336.77	444.58	397.10	335.21	309.33	323.30	339.17
Capital Outlay and Acquisition.....	7.50	15.68	16.95	16.54	24.74	28.72	50.58	21.51	14.82	13.95	20.61	23.47
Contingencies, Debt Service and Other.....	4.13	3.40	1.61	1.43	9.29	17.58	1.04	5.37	19.23	11.52	5.86	5.38
Total Expenditures.....	948.26	941.35	945.13	887.38	903.61	1,026.71	1,257.29	1,136.74	1,077.20	1,039.17	1,059.86	1,116.72
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	-0.7%	-0.2%	-2.2%	-1.2%	1.6%	4.8%	2.6%	1.6%	1.0%	1.1%	1.5%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	-0.7%	0.4%	-6.1%	1.8%	13.6%	22.5%	-9.6%	-5.2%	-3.5%	2.0%	5.4%
ADDENDUM:												
Loudoun County Population.....	121,596	132,349	141,756	156,374	169,599	185,120	196,314	211,146	229,429	247,293	263,036	278,778
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	8.8%	8.0%	8.7%	8.7%	8.8%	8.3%	8.2%	8.3%	8.2%	8.0%	7.8%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	8.8%	7.1%	10.3%	8.5%	9.2%	6.0%	7.6%	8.7%	7.8%	6.4%	6.0%

1/ Adopted budget expenditures are on a FY 07 constant dollar basis, using the Washington - Baltimore region CPI-U from the US Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The base year for the inflation factor is FY 07 (FY 07 = 100). The actual annual inflation rates were

FY 96 (2.8%); FY 97 (1.8%); FY 98 (1.3%); FY 99 (2.1%); FY 00 (3.3%); FY 01 (2.6%); FY 02 (2.4%); FY 03 (2.8%); FY 04 (2.8%); FY 05 (4.0%); FY 06 (3.2%) and FY 07 forecast (2.8%).

A2

Expenditures by Character

	Adopted FY 96	Adopted FY 97	Adopted FY 98	Adopted FY 99	Adopted FY 00	Adopted FY 01	Adopted FY 02	Adopted FY 03	Adopted FY 04	Adopted FY 05	Adopted FY 06	Proposed FY 07
<b>Personnel</b> .....	75,185,538	79,173,803	88,558,543	88,370,912	97,283,465	119,150,406	149,410,987	150,496,953	162,421,969	174,187,355	186,777,070	208,721,294
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	5.3%	8.5%	5.5%	6.7%	9.6%	12.1%	10.4%	10.1%	9.8%	9.5%	9.7%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	5.3%	11.9%	-0.2%	10.1%	22.5%	25.4%	0.7%	7.9%	7.2%	7.2%	11.7%
<b>Operations and Maintenance</b> .....	38,704,125	42,888,379	42,788,529	47,583,966	50,196,819	62,342,748	87,277,734	83,846,636	76,906,878	76,494,040	85,038,585	94,552,191
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	10.8%	5.1%	7.1%	6.7%	10.0%	14.5%	11.7%	9.0%	7.9%	8.2%	8.5%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	10.8%	-0.2%	11.2%	5.5%	24.2%	40.0%	-3.9%	-8.3%	-0.5%	11.2%	11.2%
<b>Capital Outlay and Acquisition</b> .....	911,570	2,074,594	2,402,797	2,585,645	4,196,349	5,317,172	9,930,187	4,541,491	3,399,739	3,450,062	5,422,401	6,542,891
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	127.6%	62.4%	41.6%	46.5%	42.3%	48.9%	25.8%	17.9%	15.9%	19.5%	19.6%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	127.6%	15.8%	7.6%	62.3%	26.7%	86.8%	-54.3%	-25.1%	1.5%	57.2%	20.7%
<b>Contingencies, Debt Service and Other</b> .....	502,789	449,500	228,052	223,314	1,575,539	3,253,971	204,036	1,134,078	4,413,043	2,848,828	1,542,206	1,500,000
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	-10.6%	-32.7%	-23.7%	33.0%	45.3%	-14.0%	12.3%	31.2%	21.3%	11.9%	10.4%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	-10.6%	-49.3%	-2.1%	605.5%	106.5%	-93.7%	455.8%	289.1%	-35.4%	-45.9%	-2.7%
<b>Total Expenditures</b> .....	115,304,022	124,586,275	133,977,921	138,763,837	153,252,173	190,064,297	246,822,944	240,019,158	247,141,630	256,980,285	278,780,262	311,316,376
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	8.1%	7.8%	6.4%	7.4%	10.5%	13.5%	11.0%	10.0%	9.3%	9.2%	9.4%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	8.1%	7.5%	3.6%	10.4%	24.0%	29.9%	-2.8%	3.0%	4.0%	8.5%	11.7%

Expenditures per Capita

<b>Personnel</b> .....	618.32	598.22	624.73	565.13	573.61	643.64	761.08	712.76	707.94	704.38	710.08	748.70
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	-3.3%	0.5%	-3.0%	-1.9%	0.8%	3.5%	2.1%	1.7%	1.5%	1.4%	1.8%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	-3.3%	4.4%	-9.5%	1.5%	12.2%	18.2%	-6.3%	-0.7%	-0.5%	0.8%	5.4%
<b>Operations and Maintenance</b> .....	318.30	324.06	301.85	304.30	295.97	336.77	444.58	397.10	335.21	309.33	323.30	339.17
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	1.8%	-2.6%	-1.5%	-1.8%	1.1%	5.7%	3.2%	0.6%	-0.3%	0.2%	0.6%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	1.8%	-6.9%	0.8%	-2.7%	13.8%	32.0%	-10.7%	-15.6%	-7.7%	4.5%	4.9%
<b>Capital Outlay and Acquisition</b> .....	7.50	15.68	16.95	16.54	24.74	28.72	50.58	21.51	14.82	13.95	20.61	23.47
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	109.1%	50.4%	30.2%	34.8%	30.8%	37.5%	16.2%	8.9%	7.1%	10.6%	10.9%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	109.1%	8.1%	-2.4%	49.6%	16.1%	76.1%	-57.5%	-31.1%	-5.9%	47.8%	13.9%
<b>Contingencies, Debt Service and Other</b> .....	4.13	3.40	1.61	1.43	9.29	17.58	1.04	5.37	19.23	11.52	5.86	5.38
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	-17.9%	-37.6%	-29.8%	22.4%	33.6%	-20.6%	3.8%	21.2%	12.1%	3.6%	2.4%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	-17.9%	-52.6%	-11.2%	550.5%	89.2%	-94.1%	416.8%	258.1%	-40.1%	-49.1%	-8.2%

<b>Total Expenditures per Capita</b> .....	948.26	941.35	945.13	887.38	903.61	1,026.71	1,257.29	1,136.74	1,077.20	1,039.17	1,059.86	1,116.72
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	-0.7%	-0.2%	-2.2%	-1.2%	1.6%	4.8%	2.6%	1.6%	1.0%	1.1%	1.5%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	-0.7%	0.4%	-6.1%	1.8%	13.6%	22.5%	-9.6%	-5.2%	-3.5%	2.0%	5.4%

ADDENDUM:

Loudoun County Population.....	121,596	132,349	141,756	156,374	169,599	185,120	196,314	211,146	229,429	247,293	263,036	278,778
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	8.8%	8.0%	8.7%	8.7%	8.8%	8.3%	8.2%	8.3%	8.2%	8.0%	7.8%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	8.8%	7.1%	10.3%	8.5%	9.2%	6.0%	7.6%	8.7%	7.8%	6.4%	5.0%

A3

Table 3.--FY 96 Adopted -FY 07 Proposed General Fund Operating Budget Expenditures  
Not Adjusted for Inflation

<u>Expenditures:</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 96</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 97</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 98</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 99</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 00</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 01</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 02</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 03</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 04</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 05</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 06</u>	<u>Proposed</u> <u>FY 07</u>
Personnel.....	56,420,018	60,496,239	68,539,562	69,845,428	79,392,253	99,781,128	128,148,340	132,704,210	147,219,913	164,176,587	181,665,492	208,721,294
Operations and Maintenance.....	29,043,982	32,770,759	33,116,026	37,608,783	40,965,220	52,208,213	74,857,257	73,933,733	69,708,697	72,097,831	82,711,311	94,552,191
Capital Outlay and Acquisition.....	684,052	1,585,185	1,859,636	2,043,608	3,424,607	4,452,804	8,517,024	4,004,566	3,081,537	3,251,783	5,274,005	6,542,891
Contingencies, Debt Service and Other.....	377,298	343,460	176,500	176,500	1,285,785	2,725,000	175,000	1,000,000	4,000,000	2,685,102	1,500,000	1,500,000
Total Expenditures.....	86,525,350	95,195,643	103,691,724	109,674,319	125,067,865	159,167,145	211,697,621	211,642,509	224,010,147	242,211,303	271,150,808	311,316,376
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	10.0%	9.5%	8.2%	9.6%	13.0%	16.1%	13.6%	12.6%	12.1%	12.1%	12.3%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	10.0%	8.9%	5.8%	14.0%	27.3%	33.0%	0.0%	5.8%	8.1%	11.9%	14.8%
<u>Expenditures per Capita:</u>												
Personnel.....	464.00	457.10	483.50	446.66	468.12	539.01	652.77	628.50	641.68	663.90	690.65	748.70
Operations and Maintenance.....	238.86	247.61	233.61	240.51	241.54	282.02	381.31	350.15	303.84	291.55	314.45	339.17
Capital Outlay and Acquisition.....	5.63	11.98	13.12	13.07	20.19	24.05	43.38	18.97	13.43	13.15	20.05	23.47
Contingencies, Debt Service and Other.....	3.10	2.60	1.25	1.13	7.58	14.72	0.89	4.74	17.43	10.86	5.70	5.38
Total Expenditures.....	711.58	719.28	731.48	701.36	737.43	859.81	1,078.36	1,002.35	976.38	979.45	1,030.85	1,116.72
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	1.1%	1.4%	-0.5%	0.9%	3.9%	7.2%	5.0%	4.0%	3.6%	3.8%	4.2%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	1.1%	1.7%	-4.1%	5.1%	16.6%	25.4%	-7.0%	-2.6%	0.3%	5.2%	8.3%

ADDENDUM:

	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Estimate</u>	<u>Estimate</u>
Loudoun County Population.....	121,596	132,349	141,756	156,374	169,599	185,120	196,314	211,146	229,429	247,293	263,036	278,778
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	8.8%	8.0%	8.7%	8.7%	8.8%	8.3%	8.2%	8.3%	8.2%	8.0%	7.8%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	8.8%	7.1%	10.3%	8.5%	9.2%	6.0%	7.6%	8.7%	7.8%	6.4%	6.0%

AA



Table 4.--FY 96 Adopted -FY 07 Proposed General Fund Operating Budget Expenditure Detail  
Not Adjusted for Inflation

Expenditures by Character		Adopted FY 96	Adopted FY 97	Adopted FY 98	Adopted FY 99	Adopted FY 00	Adopted FY 01	Adopted FY 02	Adopted FY 03	Adopted FY 04	Adopted FY 05	Adopted FY 06	Proposed FY 07
<i>Personnel</i>													
Average Annual Growth since FY 96	56,420,018	60,496,239	68,539,562	69,845,428	79,392,253	99,781,128	128,148,340	132,704,210	147,219,913	164,176,587	181,665,492	208,721,294	
Annual Growth from Prior Year	NA	7.2%	10.2%	7.4%	8.9%	12.1%	14.7%	13.0%	12.7%	12.6%	12.4%	12.6%	12.6%
	NA	7.2%	13.3%	1.9%	13.7%	25.7%	28.4%	3.6%	10.9%	11.5%	10.7%	10.7%	14.9%
<i>Operations and Maintenance</i>													
Average Annual Growth since FY 96	29,043,982	32,770,759	33,116,026	37,608,783	40,965,220	52,208,213	74,857,257	73,933,733	69,708,697	72,097,831	82,711,311	94,552,191	
Annual Growth from Prior Year	NA	12.8%	6.8%	9.0%	9.0%	12.4%	17.1%	14.3%	11.6%	10.6%	11.0%	11.3%	11.3%
	NA	12.8%	1.1%	13.6%	8.9%	27.4%	43.4%	-1.2%	-5.7%	3.4%	14.7%	14.3%	14.3%
<i>Capital Outlay and Acquisition</i>													
Average Annual Growth since FY 96	684,052	1,585,185	1,859,636	2,043,608	3,424,607	4,452,804	8,517,024	4,004,566	3,081,537	3,251,783	5,274,005	6,542,891	
Annual Growth from Prior Year	NA	131.7%	64.9%	44.0%	49.6%	45.4%	52.2%	28.7%	20.7%	18.9%	22.7%	22.8%	22.8%
	NA	131.7%	17.3%	9.9%	67.6%	30.0%	91.3%	-53.0%	-23.0%	5.5%	62.2%	24.1%	24.1%
<i>Contingencies, Debt Service and Other</i>													
Average Annual Growth since FY 96	377,298	343,460	176,500	176,500	1,285,785	2,725,000	175,000	1,000,000	4,000,000	2,685,102	1,500,000	1,500,000	
Annual Growth from Prior Year	NA	-9.0%	-31.6%	-22.4%	35.9%	48.5%	-12.0%	14.9%	34.3%	24.4%	14.8%	13.4%	13.4%
	NA	-9.0%	-48.6%	0.0%	628.5%	111.9%	-93.6%	471.4%	300.0%	-32.9%	-44.1%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Total Expenditures</i>													
Average Annual Growth since FY 96	86,525,350	95,195,643	103,691,724	109,674,319	125,067,865	159,167,145	211,697,621	211,642,509	224,010,147	242,211,303	271,150,808	311,316,376	
Annual Growth from Prior Year	NA	10.0%	9.5%	8.2%	9.6%	13.0%	16.1%	13.6%	12.6%	12.1%	12.1%	12.3%	12.3%
	NA	10.0%	8.9%	5.8%	14.0%	27.3%	33.0%	0.0%	5.8%	8.1%	11.9%	14.8%	14.8%
<i>Expenditures per Capita</i>													
<i>Personnel</i>													
Average Annual Growth since FY 96	464.00	457.10	483.50	446.66	468.12	539.01	652.77	628.50	641.68	663.90	690.65	748.70	
Annual Growth from Prior Year	NA	-1.5%	2.1%	-1.3%	0.2%	3.0%	5.9%	4.4%	4.1%	4.1%	4.1%	4.4%	4.4%
	NA	-1.5%	5.8%	-7.6%	4.8%	15.1%	21.1%	-3.7%	2.1%	3.5%	4.0%	8.4%	8.4%
<i>Operations and Maintenance</i>													
Average Annual Growth since FY 96	238.86	247.61	233.61	240.51	241.54	282.02	381.31	350.15	303.84	291.55	314.45	339.17	
Annual Growth from Prior Year	NA	3.7%	-1.1%	0.2%	0.3%	3.4%	8.1%	5.6%	3.1%	2.2%	2.8%	3.2%	3.2%
	NA	3.7%	-5.7%	3.0%	0.4%	16.8%	35.2%	-8.2%	-13.2%	-4.0%	7.9%	7.9%	7.9%
<i>Capital Outlay and Acquisition</i>													
Average Annual Growth since FY 96	5.63	11.98	13.12	13.07	20.19	24.05	43.38	18.97	13.43	13.15	20.05	23.47	
Annual Growth from Prior Year	NA	112.9%	52.7%	32.4%	37.6%	33.7%	40.6%	19.0%	11.5%	9.9%	13.6%	13.9%	13.9%
	NA	112.9%	9.5%	-0.4%	54.5%	19.1%	80.4%	-56.3%	-29.2%	-2.1%	52.5%	17.1%	17.1%
<i>Contingencies, Debt Service and Other</i>													
Average Annual Growth since FY 96	3.10	2.60	1.25	1.13	7.58	14.72	0.89	4.74	17.43	10.86	5.70	5.38	
Annual Growth from Prior Year	NA	-16.4%	-36.7%	-28.6%	25.0%	36.5%	-18.8%	6.2%	24.1%	14.9%	6.3%	5.1%	5.1%
	NA	-16.4%	-52.0%	-9.3%	571.7%	94.2%	-93.9%	431.3%	268.1%	-37.7%	-47.5%	-5.6%	-5.6%
<i>Total Expenditures per Capita</i>													
Average Annual Growth since FY 96	711.58	719.28	731.48	701.36	737.43	859.81	1,078.36	1,002.35	976.38	979.45	1,030.85	1,116.72	
Annual Growth from Prior Year	NA	1.1%	1.4%	-0.5%	0.9%	3.9%	7.2%	5.0%	4.0%	3.6%	3.8%	4.2%	4.2%
	NA	1.1%	1.7%	-4.1%	5.1%	16.6%	25.4%	-7.0%	-2.6%	0.3%	5.2%	8.3%	8.3%

A5

Table 5A.--FY 96 Adopted -FY 07 Proposed General Fund Transfers to School Fund  
Not Adjusted for Inflation

<u>Fund Transfer</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 96</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 97</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 98</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 99</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 00</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 01</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 02</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 03</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 04</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 05</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 06</u>	<u>Proposed</u> <u>FY 07</u>
General Fund Transfer to the School Fund.....	91,263,584	101,263,584	112,463,584	125,702,063	145,462,418	168,896,295	211,451,391	264,521,268	292,435,150	351,902,707	407,081,000	467,573,177
Average Annual Growth since FY 96....	NA	11.0%	11.0%	11.3%	12.4%	13.1%	15.0%	16.4%	15.7%	16.2%	16.1%	16.0%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	11.0%	11.1%	11.8%	15.7%	16.1%	25.2%	25.1%	10.6%	20.3%	15.7%	14.9%
Transfer Amount per Capita.....	751	765	793	804	858	912	1,077	1,253	1,275	1,423	1,548	1,677
Average Annual Growth since FY 96....	NA	1.9%	2.8%	2.3%	3.4%	4.0%	6.2%	7.6%	6.8%	7.4%	7.5%	7.6%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	1.9%	3.7%	1.3%	6.7%	6.4%	18.1%	16.3%	1.7%	11.6%	8.8%	8.4%
Transfer Amount per Student.....	4,571	4,659	4,729	4,818	5,053	5,311	6,113	7,048	7,176	7,995	8,595	9,215
Average Annual Growth since FY 96....	NA	1.9%	1.7%	1.8%	2.5%	3.0%	5.0%	6.4%	5.8%	6.4%	6.5%	6.6%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	1.9%	1.5%	1.9%	4.9%	5.1%	15.1%	15.3%	1.8%	11.4%	7.5%	7.2%

Table 5B.--FY 96 Adopted - FY 07 Proposed General Fund Transfers to School Fund  
Adjusted for Inflation

<u>Fund Transfer</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 96</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 97</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 98</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 99</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 00</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 01</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 02</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 03</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 04</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 05</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 06</u>	<u>Proposed</u> <u>FY 07</u>
General Fund Transfer to the School Fund.....	121,618,212	132,527,627	145,311,859	159,042,707	178,242,681	201,682,046	246,535,859	299,987,807	322,632,258	373,360,189	418,535,164	467,573,177
Average Annual Growth since FY 96....	NA	9.0%	9.3%	9.4%	10.0%	10.6%	12.5%	13.8%	13.0%	13.3%	13.2%	13.0%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	9.0%	9.6%	9.4%	12.1%	13.2%	22.2%	21.7%	7.5%	15.7%	12.1%	11.7%
Transfer Amount per Capita.....	1,000	1,001	1,025	1,017	1,051	1,089	1,256	1,421	1,406	1,510	1,591	1,677
Average Annual Growth since FY 96....	NA	0.1%	1.2%	0.6%	1.2%	1.7%	3.9%	5.1%	4.4%	4.7%	4.8%	4.8%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	0.1%	2.4%	-0.8%	3.3%	3.7%	15.3%	13.1%	-1.0%	7.4%	5.4%	5.4%
Transfer Amount per Student.....	6,091	6,098	6,110	6,096	6,192	6,341	7,128	7,993	7,917	8,483	8,837	9,215
Average Annual Growth since FY 96....	NA	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%	0.8%	2.7%	4.0%	3.3%	3.7%	3.8%	3.8%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	0.1%	0.2%	-0.2%	1.6%	2.4%	12.4%	12.1%	-0.9%	7.1%	4.2%	4.3%

ADDENDUM:

Loudoun County Student Population.....	<u>Actual</u> 19,967	<u>Actual</u> 21,733	<u>Actual</u> 23,782	<u>Actual</u> 26,091	<u>Actual</u> 28,787	<u>Actual</u> 31,804	<u>Actual</u> 34,589	<u>Actual</u> 37,532	<u>Actual</u> 40,751	<u>Actual</u> 44,014	<u>Estimate</u> 47,361	<u>Estimate</u> 50,740
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	8.8%	9.1%	9.3%	9.6%	9.8%	9.6%	9.4%	9.3%	9.2%	9.0%	8.8%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	8.8%	9.4%	9.7%	10.3%	10.5%	8.8%	8.5%	8.6%	8.0%	7.6%	7.1%

A6

Table 6.--FY 96 Adopted - FY 07 Proposed General Fund and School Fund Combined Expenditures  
Not Adjusted for Inflation

Fund	Adopted FY 96	Adopted FY 97	Adopted FY 98	Adopted FY 99	Adopted FY 00	Adopted FY 01	Adopted FY 02	Adopted FY 03	Adopted FY 04	Adopted FY 05	Adopted FY 06	Proposed FY 07
General Fund Expenditures.....	86,525,350	95,195,643	103,691,724	109,674,319	125,067,865	159,167,145	211,697,621	211,642,509	224,010,147	242,211,303	271,150,808	311,316,376
% of total budget (General Fund & School Fund only)	42.7%	41.3%	38.6%	37.9%	37.9%	38.8%	41.6%	37.3%	36.2%	34.1%	33.5%	32.8%
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	10.0%	9.5%	8.2%	9.6%	13.0%	16.1%	13.6%	12.6%	12.1%	12.1%	12.3%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	10.0%	8.9%	5.8%	14.0%	27.3%	33.0%	0.0%	5.8%	8.1%	11.9%	14.8%
General Fund Expenditures per capita.....	711.6	719.3	731.5	701.4	737.4	859.8	1,078.4	1,002.4	976.4	979.5	1,030.9	1,116.7
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	1.1%	1.4%	-0.5%	0.9%	3.9%	7.2%	5.0%	4.0%	3.6%	3.8%	4.2%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	1.1%	1.7%	-4.1%	5.1%	16.6%	25.4%	-7.0%	-2.6%	0.3%	5.2%	8.3%
School Fund Expenditures.....	116,289,089	135,414,312	164,795,376	179,357,161	204,641,515	251,584,478	297,093,646	355,764,893	395,611,766	469,011,715	537,542,494	638,038,387
% of total budget (General Fund & School Fund only)	57.3%	58.7%	61.4%	62.1%	62.1%	61.2%	58.4%	62.7%	63.8%	65.9%	66.5%	67.2%
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	16.4%	19.0%	15.5%	15.2%	16.7%	16.9%	17.3%	16.5%	16.8%	16.5%	16.7%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	16.4%	21.7%	8.8%	14.1%	22.9%	18.1%	19.7%	11.2%	18.6%	14.6%	18.7%
School Fund Expenditures per capita.....	956	1,023	1,163	1,147	1,207	1,359	1,513	1,685	1,724	1,897	2,044	2,289
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	7.0%	10.3%	6.2%	6.0%	7.3%	7.9%	8.4%	7.6%	7.9%	7.9%	8.3%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	7.0%	13.6%	-1.3%	5.2%	12.6%	11.4%	11.3%	2.3%	10.0%	7.8%	12.0%
School Fund Expenditures per student.....	5,824	6,231	6,929	6,874	7,109	7,910	8,589	9,479	9,708	10,656	11,350	12,575
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	7.0%	9.1%	5.7%	5.1%	6.3%	6.7%	7.2%	6.6%	6.9%	6.9%	7.2%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	7.0%	11.2%	-0.8%	3.4%	11.3%	8.6%	10.4%	2.4%	9.8%	6.5%	10.8%
<u>ADDENDUM:</u>												
Loudoun County Student Population.....	19,967	21,733	23,782	26,091	28,787	31,804	34,589	37,532	40,751	44,014	47,361	50,740
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	8.8%	9.1%	9.3%	9.6%	9.8%	9.6%	9.4%	9.3%	9.2%	9.0%	8.8%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	8.8%	9.4%	9.7%	10.3%	10.5%	8.8%	8.5%	8.6%	8.0%	7.6%	7.1%
Loudoun County Population.....	121,596	132,349	141,756	156,374	169,599	185,120	196,314	211,146	229,429	247,293	263,036	278,778
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	8.8%	8.0%	8.7%	8.7%	8.8%	8.3%	8.2%	8.3%	8.2%	8.0%	7.8%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	8.8%	7.1%	10.3%	8.5%	9.2%	6.0%	7.6%	8.7%	7.8%	6.4%	6.0%

A7

Table 7.--FY 96 Adopted - FY 07 Proposed General Fund and School Fund Combined Expenditures

Adjusted for Inflation (amounts in FY 07 constant dollars)												
Fund	Adopted FY 96	Adopted FY 97	Adopted FY 98	Adopted FY 99	Adopted FY 00	Adopted FY 01	Adopted FY 02	Adopted FY 03	Adopted FY 04	Adopted FY 05	Adopted FY 06	Proposed FY 07
General Fund Expenditures.....	115,304,022	124,586,275	133,977,921	138,763,837	153,252,173	190,064,297	246,822,944	240,019,158	247,141,630	256,980,285	278,780,262	311,316,376
% of total budget (Gen Fund & School Fund only).....	42.7%	41.3%	38.6%	37.9%	37.9%	38.8%	41.6%	37.3%	36.2%	34.1%	33.5%	32.8%
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	8.1%	7.8%	6.4%	7.4%	10.5%	13.5%	11.0%	10.0%	9.3%	9.2%	9.4%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	8.1%	7.5%	3.6%	10.4%	24.0%	29.9%	-2.8%	3.0%	4.0%	8.5%	11.7%
General Fund Expenditures per capita.....	948.3	941.3	945.1	887.4	903.6	1,026.7	1,257.3	1,136.7	1,077.2	1,039.2	1,059.9	1,116.7
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	-0.7%	-0.2%	-2.2%	-1.2%	1.6%	4.8%	2.6%	1.6%	1.0%	1.1%	1.5%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	-0.7%	0.4%	-6.1%	1.8%	13.6%	22.5%	-9.6%	-5.2%	-3.5%	2.0%	5.4%
School Fund Expenditures.....	154,967,298	177,222,026	212,928,679	226,929,040	250,757,913	300,421,465	346,388,061	403,465,214	436,462,981	497,609,990	552,667,494	638,038,387
% of total budget (Gen Fund & School Fund only).....	57.3%	58.7%	61.4%	62.1%	62.1%	61.2%	58.4%	62.7%	63.8%	65.9%	66.5%	67.2%
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	14.4%	17.2%	13.6%	12.8%	14.2%	14.3%	14.6%	13.8%	13.8%	13.6%	13.7%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	14.4%	20.1%	6.6%	10.5%	19.8%	15.3%	16.5%	8.2%	14.0%	11.1%	15.4%
School Fund Expenditures per capita.....	1,274	1,339	1,502	1,451	1,479	1,623	1,764	1,911	1,902	2,012	2,101	2,289
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	5.1%	8.6%	4.4%	3.8%	5.0%	5.6%	6.0%	5.1%	5.2%	5.1%	5.5%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	5.1%	12.2%	-3.4%	1.9%	9.8%	8.7%	8.3%	-0.4%	5.8%	4.4%	8.9%
School Fund Expenditures per student.....	7,761	8,155	8,953	8,698	8,711	9,446	10,014	10,750	10,710	11,306	11,669	12,575
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	5.1%	7.4%	3.9%	2.9%	4.0%	4.3%	4.8%	4.1%	4.3%	4.2%	4.5%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	5.1%	9.8%	-2.9%	0.2%	8.4%	6.0%	7.3%	-0.4%	5.6%	3.2%	7.8%

## APPENDIX:

	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimate	Estimate
Loudoun County Student Population.....	19,967	21,733	23,782	26,091	28,787	31,804	34,589	37,532	40,751	44,014	47,361	50,740
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	8.8%	9.1%	9.3%	9.6%	9.8%	9.6%	9.4%	9.3%	9.2%	9.0%	8.8%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	8.8%	9.4%	9.7%	10.3%	10.5%	8.8%	8.5%	8.6%	8.0%	7.6%	7.1%
Loudoun County Population.....	121,596	132,349	141,756	156,374	169,599	185,120	196,314	211,146	229,429	247,293	263,036	278,778
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	8.8%	8.0%	8.7%	8.7%	8.8%	8.3%	8.2%	8.3%	8.2%	8.0%	7.8%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	8.8%	7.1%	10.3%	8.5%	9.2%	6.0%	7.6%	8.7%	7.8%	6.4%	6.0%

A8

Table 8.--FY 96 Adopted - FY 07 Proposed Debt Service Fund: General Government and School System Expenditures  
Not Adjusted for Inflation

Fund	Adopted FY 96	Adopted FY 97	Adopted FY 98	Adopted FY 99	Adopted FY 00	Adopted FY 01	Adopted FY 02	Adopted FY 03	Adopted FY 04	Adopted FY 05	Adopted FY 06	Proposed FY 07
<u>Debt Service Fund:</u>												
General Government Expenditures .....	10,441,516	9,333,322	9,211,982	8,885,990	8,636,771	9,943,763	10,618,965	13,738,728	10,548,629	13,203,962	15,144,365	19,422,650
School System Expenditures .....	7,470,652	11,337,314	13,018,465	18,625,111	26,620,462	21,629,287	48,401,105	60,237,501	73,743,304	83,102,576	97,552,825	102,593,040
Total Debt Service Fund .....	17,912,168	20,670,636	22,230,447	27,511,101	35,257,233	41,573,050	59,020,070	73,976,229	84,291,933	96,306,538	112,697,190	122,015,690
Average Annual Growth since FY 96 .....	NA	15.4%	11.4%	15.4%	18.4%	18.3%	22.0%	22.5%	21.4%	20.6%	20.2%	19.1%
Annual Growth from Prior Year .....	NA	15.4%	7.5%	23.8%	28.2%	17.9%	42.0%	25.3%	13.9%	14.3%	17.0%	8.3%
Total Debt Service Fund per capita .....	147	156	157	176	208	225	301	350	367	389	428	438
Average Annual Growth since FY 96 .....	NA	6.0%	3.2%	6.1%	9.0%	8.8%	12.6%	13.2%	12.1%	11.4%	11.3%	10.4%
Annual Growth from Prior Year .....	NA	6.0%	0.4%	12.2%	18.2%	8.0%	33.9%	16.5%	4.9%	6.0%	10.0%	2.2%
<u>General Government Debt Service Expenditures:</u>												
Average Annual Growth since FY 96 .....	NA	-10.6%	-6.1%	-5.2%	-4.6%	-1.0%	0.3%	4.0%	0.1%	2.6%	3.8%	5.8%
Annual Growth from Prior Year .....	NA	-10.6%	-1.3%	-3.5%	-2.8%	15.1%	6.8%	29.4%	-23.2%	25.2%	14.7%	28.3%
General Government Debt Service Expenditures per capita .....	86	71	65	57	51	54	54	65	46	53	58	70
Average Annual Growth since FY 96 .....	NA	-17.9%	-13.0%	-12.9%	-12.2%	-9.0%	-7.4%	-3.9%	-7.5%	-5.1%	-3.9%	-1.9%
Annual Growth from Prior Year .....	NA	-17.9%	-7.8%	-12.6%	-10.4%	5.5%	0.7%	20.3%	-29.3%	16.1%	7.8%	21.0%
<u>School System Debt Service Expenditures:</u>												
Average Annual Growth since FY 96 .....	NA	51.8%	32.0%	35.6%	37.4%	33.5%	36.5%	34.7%	33.1%	30.7%	29.3%	26.9%
Annual Growth from Prior Year .....	NA	51.8%	14.8%	43.1%	42.9%	18.8%	53.0%	24.5%	22.4%	12.7%	17.4%	5.2%
School System Debt Service Expenditures per capita .....	61	86	92	119	157	171	247	285	321	336	371	368
Average Annual Growth since FY 96 .....	NA	39.4%	22.3%	24.7%	26.4%	22.7%	26.1%	24.5%	23.0%	20.8%	19.7%	17.7%
Annual Growth from Prior Year .....	NA	39.4%	7.2%	29.7%	31.8%	8.9%	44.3%	15.7%	12.7%	4.6%	10.4%	-0.8%
School System Debt Service Expenditures per student .....	374	522	547	714	925	995	1,399	1,605	1,810	1,888	2,060	2,022
Average Annual Growth since FY 96 .....	NA	39.4%	21.0%	24.0%	25.4%	21.6%	24.6%	23.1%	21.8%	19.7%	18.6%	16.6%
Annual Growth from Prior Year .....	NA	39.4%	4.9%	30.4%	29.5%	7.5%	40.7%	14.7%	12.8%	4.3%	9.1%	-1.8%

A9

Table 9.—FY 96 Adopted - FY 07 Proposed Debt Service Fund: General Government and School System Expenditures

Adjusted for Inflation

(amounts in FY 07 constant dollars)

<u>Debt Service Fund:</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 96</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 97</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 98</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 99</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 00</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 01</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 02</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 03</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 04</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 05</u>	<u>Adopted</u> <u>FY 06</u>	<u>Proposed</u> <u>FY 07</u>
General Government Expenditures.....	13,914,405	12,214,885	11,902,610	11,242,870	10,583,086	11,874,023	12,380,886	15,580,792	11,637,890	14,009,082	15,570,487	19,422,650
School System Expenditures.....	9,955,420	14,837,588	16,820,888	23,565,151	32,619,439	37,769,090	56,431,920	68,314,037	81,358,102	88,169,806	100,297,699	107,593,040
Total Debt Service Fund.....	23,869,826	27,052,473	28,723,498	34,808,020	43,202,525	49,643,113	68,812,807	83,894,830	92,995,991	102,178,888	115,868,186	122,015,690
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	13.3%	9.7%	13.4%	16.0%	15.8%	19.3%	19.7%	18.5%	17.5%	17.1%	16.0%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	13.3%	6.2%	21.2%	24.1%	14.9%	38.6%	21.9%	10.8%	9.9%	13.4%	5.3%
Total Debt Service Fund per capita.....	196	204	203	223	255	268	351	397	405	413	441	438
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	4.1%	1.6%	4.3%	6.7%	6.4%	10.1%	10.6%	9.5%	8.6%	8.4%	7.6%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	4.1%	-0.9%	9.9%	14.4%	5.3%	30.7%	13.4%	2.0%	1.9%	6.6%	-0.6%
<u>General Government Debt Service Expenditures:</u>												
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	-12.2%	-7.5%	-6.9%	-6.6%	-3.1%	-1.9%	1.6%	-2.2%	0.1%	1.1%	3.1%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	-12.2%	-2.6%	-5.5%	-5.9%	12.2%	4.3%	25.8%	-25.3%	20.4%	11.1%	24.7%
General Government Debt Service Expenditures per capita.....	114	92	84	72	62	64	63	74	51	57	59	70
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	-19.3%	-14.3%	-14.4%	-14.1%	-10.9%	-9.5%	-6.1%	-9.7%	-7.5%	-6.4%	-4.4%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	-19.3%	-9.0%	-14.4%	-13.2%	2.8%	-1.7%	17.0%	-31.3%	11.7%	4.5%	17.7%
<u>School System Debt Service Expenditures:</u>												
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	49.0%	30.0%	33.3%	34.5%	30.6%	33.5%	31.7%	30.0%	27.4%	26.0%	23.6%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	49.0%	13.4%	40.1%	38.4%	15.8%	49.4%	21.1%	19.1%	8.4%	13.8%	2.3%
School System Debt Service Expenditures per capita.....	82	112	119	151	192	204	287	324	355	357	381	368
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	36.9%	20.4%	22.6%	23.8%	20.0%	23.3%	21.7%	20.1%	17.8%	16.6%	14.6%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	36.9%	5.8%	27.0%	27.6%	6.1%	40.9%	12.6%	9.6%	0.5%	6.9%	-3.5%
School System Debt Service Expenditures per student.....	499	683	707	903	1,133	1,188	1,631	1,820	1,996	2,003	2,118	2,022
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	36.9%	19.1%	21.9%	22.8%	19.0%	21.8%	20.3%	18.9%	16.7%	15.6%	6.9%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	36.9%	3.6%	27.7%	25.5%	4.8%	37.4%	11.6%	9.7%	0.3%	5.7%	-4.5%

A10

Table 10.--FY 96 Adopted - FY 07 Proposed General Government and School System Combined Expenditures incl. Debt Service  
Not Adjusted for Inflation

Combined Expenditures:	Adopted FY 96	Adopted FY 97	Adopted FY 98	Adopted FY 99	Adopted FY 00	Adopted FY 01	Adopted FY 02	Adopted FY 03	Adopted FY 04	Adopted FY 05	Adopted FY 06	Proposed FY 07
<b>General Fund</b>	86,525,350	95,195,643	103,691,724	109,674,319	125,067,865	159,167,145	211,697,621	211,642,509	224,010,147	242,211,303	271,150,808	311,316,376
General Government Debt Service Fund.....	10,441,516	9,333,322	9,211,982	8,885,990	8,636,771	9,943,763	10,618,965	13,738,728	10,548,629	13,203,962	15,144,365	19,422,650
School Fund.....	116,289,089	135,414,312	164,795,376	179,357,161	204,641,515	251,584,478	297,093,646	355,764,893	395,611,766	469,011,715	537,542,494	638,038,387
School Debt Service Fund.....	7,470,652	11,337,314	13,018,465	18,625,111	26,620,462	31,629,287	48,401,105	60,237,501	73,743,304	83,102,576	97,552,825	102,593,040
Total Combined Expenditures.....	220,726,607	251,280,591	290,717,547	316,542,581	364,966,613	452,324,673	567,811,337	641,383,631	703,913,846	807,529,556	921,390,492	1,071,370,453
Average Annual Growth since FY 96....	NA	13.8%	14.8%	12.8%	13.4%	15.4%	17.1%	16.5%	15.6%	15.5%	15.4%	15.4%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	13.8%	15.7%	8.9%	15.3%	23.9%	25.5%	13.0%	9.7%	14.7%	14.1%	16.3%
<b>Total Combined Expenditures per capita</b>	1,815	1,899	2,051	2,024	2,152	2,443	2,892	3,038	3,068	3,265	3,503	3,843
Average Annual Growth since FY 96....	NA	4.6%	6.3%	3.7%	4.3%	6.1%	8.1%	7.6%	6.8%	6.7%	6.8%	7.1%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	4.6%	8.0%	-1.3%	6.3%	13.5%	18.4%	5.0%	1.0%	6.4%	7.3%	9.7%
<b>General Government Combined Expenditures (General Fund and Debt Service Fund)</b>	96,966,866	104,528,965	112,903,706	118,560,309	133,704,636	169,110,908	222,316,586	225,381,237	234,558,776	255,415,265	286,295,173	330,739,026
Average Annual Growth since FY 96....	NA	7.8%	7.9%	6.9%	8.4%	11.8%	14.8%	12.8%	11.7%	11.4%	11.4%	11.8%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	7.8%	8.0%	5.0%	12.8%	26.5%	31.5%	1.4%	4.1%	8.9%	12.1%	15.5%
<b>General Government Combined Expenditures (General Fund and General Government Debt Service) per capita</b>	797	790	796	758	788	914	1,132	1,067	1,022	1,033	1,088	1,186
Average Annual Growth since FY 96....	NA	-1.0%	-0.1%	-1.7%	-0.3%	2.8%	6.0%	4.3%	3.2%	2.9%	3.2%	3.7%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	-1.0%	0.8%	-4.8%	4.0%	15.9%	24.0%	-5.7%	-4.2%	1.0%	5.4%	9.0%
<b>General Government Combined Expenditures (General Fund and Debt Service Fund) as a % of Total</b>	43.9%	41.6%	38.8%	37.5%	36.6%	37.4%	39.2%	35.1%	33.3%	31.6%	31.1%	30.9%
<b>School System Combined Expenditures (School Fund and School Debt Service)</b>	123,759,741	146,751,626	177,813,841	197,982,272	231,261,977	283,213,765	345,494,751	416,002,394	469,355,070	552,114,291	635,095,319	740,631,427
Average Annual Growth since FY 96....	NA	18.6%	19.9%	17.0%	16.9%	18.0%	18.7%	18.9%	18.1%	18.1%	17.8%	17.7%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	18.6%	21.2%	11.3%	16.8%	22.5%	22.0%	20.4%	12.8%	17.6%	15.0%	16.6%
<b>School System Combined Expenditures (School Fund and School Debt Service) per capita</b>	1,018	1,109	1,254	1,266	1,364	1,530	1,760	1,970	2,046	2,233	2,414	2,657
Average Annual Growth since FY 96....	NA	8.9%	11.0%	7.5%	7.6%	8.5%	9.6%	9.9%	9.1%	9.1%	9.0%	9.1%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	8.9%	13.1%	0.9%	7.7%	12.2%	15.0%	11.9%	3.8%	9.1%	8.1%	10.0%
<b>School System Combined Expenditures (School Fund and School Debt Service) per student</b>	6,198	6,752	7,477	7,588	8,034	8,905	9,989	11,084	11,518	12,544	13,410	14,597
Average Annual Growth since FY 96....	NA	8.9%	9.8%	7.0%	6.7%	7.5%	8.3%	8.7%	8.1%	8.1%	8.0%	8.1%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	8.9%	10.7%	1.5%	5.9%	10.8%	12.2%	11.0%	3.9%	8.9%	6.9%	8.9%
<b>School System Combined Expenditures (School Fund and School Debt Service) as a % of Total</b>	56.1%	58.4%	61.2%	62.5%	63.4%	62.6%	60.8%	64.9%	66.7%	68.4%	68.9%	69.1%

A11

Table 11.--FY 96 Adopted - FY 07 Proposed General Government and School System Combined Expenditures incl. Debt Service  
Adjusted for Inflation  
(amounts in FY 07 constant dollars)

	Adopted FY 96	Adopted FY 97	Adopted FY 98	Adopted FY 99	Adopted FY 00	Adopted FY 01	Adopted FY 02	Adopted FY 03	Adopted FY 04	Adopted FY 05	Adopted FY 06	Proposed FY 07
<b>Combined Expenditures:</b>												
General Fund.....	115,304,022	124,586,275	133,977,921	138,763,837	153,252,173	190,064,297	246,822,944	240,019,158	247,141,630	256,980,285	278,780,262	311,316,376
General Government Debt Service Fund.....	13,914,405	12,214,885	11,902,610	11,242,870	10,583,086	11,874,023	12,380,886	15,580,792	11,637,890	14,009,082	15,570,487	19,422,650
School Fund.....	154,967,298	177,222,026	212,928,679	226,929,040	250,757,913	300,421,465	346,388,061	403,465,214	436,462,981	497,609,990	552,667,494	638,038,387
School Debt Service Fund.....	9,955,420	14,837,588	16,820,888	23,565,151	32,619,439	37,769,090	56,431,920	68,314,037	81,358,102	88,169,806	100,297,699	102,593,040
Total Combined Expenditures.....	294,141,146	328,860,773	375,630,098	400,500,897	447,212,610	540,128,874	662,023,812	727,379,202	776,600,602	856,769,163	947,315,942	1,071,370,453
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	11.8%	13.0%	10.8%	11.0%	12.9%	14.5%	13.8%	12.9%	12.6%	12.4%	12.5%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	11.8%	14.2%	6.6%	11.7%	20.8%	22.6%	9.9%	6.8%	10.3%	10.6%	13.1%
Total Combined Expenditures per capita.....	2,419	2,485	2,650	2,561	2,637	2,918	3,372	3,445	3,385	3,465	3,601	3,843
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	2.7%	4.7%	1.9%	2.2%	3.8%	5.7%	5.2%	4.3%	4.1%	4.1%	4.3%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	2.7%	6.6%	-3.3%	3.0%	10.7%	15.6%	2.2%	-1.7%	2.4%	4.0%	6.7%
<b>General Government Combined Expenditures (General Fund and Debt Service Fund).....</b>												
.....	129,218,428	136,801,160	145,880,531	150,006,707	163,835,258	201,938,320	259,203,831	255,599,950	258,779,519	270,989,367	294,350,749	330,739,026
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	5.9%	6.3%	5.1%	6.1%	9.3%	12.3%	10.2%	9.1%	8.6%	8.6%	8.9%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	5.9%	6.6%	2.8%	9.2%	23.3%	28.4%	-1.4%	1.2%	4.7%	8.6%	12.4%
<b>General Government Combined Expenditures (General Fund and General Government Debt Service) per capita.....</b>												
.....	1063	1034	1029	959	966	1,091	1,320	1,211	1,128	1,096	1,119	1,186
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	-2.7%	-1.6%	-3.4%	-2.4%	0.5%	21.0%	1.9%	0.7%	0.3%	0.5%	1.0%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	-2.7%	-0.4%	-6.8%	0.7%	12.9%	21.0%	-8.3%	-6.8%	-2.8%	2.1%	6.0%
<b>General Government Combined Expenditures (General Fund and Debt Service Fund) as a % of Total.....</b>												
.....	43.9%	41.6%	38.8%	37.5%	36.6%	37.4%	39.2%	35.1%	33.3%	31.6%	31.1%	30.9%
<b>School System Combined Expenditures (School Fund and School Debt Service).....</b>												
.....	164,922,718	192,059,614	229,749,567	250,494,190	283,377,352	338,190,555	402,819,981	471,779,251	517,821,083	585,779,797	652,965,193	740,631,427
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	16.5%	18.0%	14.9%	14.5%	15.4%	16.0%	16.2%	15.4%	15.1%	14.8%	14.6%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	16.5%	19.6%	9.0%	13.1%	19.3%	19.1%	17.1%	9.8%	13.1%	11.5%	13.4%
<b>School System Combined Expenditures (School Fund and School Debt Service) per capita.....</b>												
.....	1,356	1,451	1,621	1,602	1,671	1,827	2,052	2,234	2,257	2,369	2,482	2,657
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	7.0%	9.3%	5.7%	5.4%	6.1%	7.1%	7.4%	6.6%	6.4%	6.2%	6.3%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	7.0%	11.7%	-1.2%	4.3%	9.3%	12.3%	8.9%	1.0%	5.0%	4.8%	7.0%
<b>School System Combined Expenditures (School Fund and School Debt Service) per student.....</b>												
.....	8,260	8,837	9,661	9,601	9,844	10,634	11,646	12,570	12,707	13,309	13,787	14,597
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	7.0%	8.1%	5.1%	4.5%	5.2%	5.9%	6.2%	5.5%	5.4%	5.3%	5.3%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	7.0%	9.3%	-0.6%	2.5%	8.0%	9.5%	7.9%	1.1%	4.7%	3.6%	5.9%
<b>School System Combined Expenditures (School Fund and School Debt Service) as a % of Total.....</b>												
.....	56.1%	58.4%	61.2%	62.5%	63.4%	62.6%	60.8%	64.9%	66.7%	68.4%	68.9%	69.1%

A12



Table 12.--FY 96 Adopted - FY 07 Proposed General Fund and School Fund FTE Counts

FTE counts:	Adopted FY 96	Adopted FY 97	Adopted FY 98	Adopted FY 99	Adopted FY 00	Adopted FY 01	Adopted FY 02	Adopted FY 03	Adopted FY 04	Adopted FY 05	Adopted FY 06	Proposed FY 07
School Fund (1).....	2,343.80	2,594.30	2,875.90	3,244.90	3,631.00	4,065.20	4,625.09	5,271.90	5,722.20	6,429.40	7,143.50	7,679.90
General Government (2).....	1,371.55	1,428.38	1,539.23	1,622.67	1,803.11	2,119.65	2,464.69	2,591.84	2,651.84	2,779.38	3,024.32	3,265.13
Central Services Fund.....	7.00	9.73	9.73	9.73	9.73	11.73	12.73	12.73	12.94	12.27	13.27	13.27
Law Library Fund.....	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53
Total FTEs.....	3,722.88	4,032.94	4,425.39	4,877.83	5,444.37	6,197.11	7,103.04	7,877.00	8,387.51	9,221.58	10,181.62	10,958.83
FTE counts growth rates:												
School Fund FTEs (1):												
Average Annual Growth since FY 96..	NA	10.7%	10.8%	11.5%	11.6%	11.6%	12.0%	12.3%	11.8%	11.9%	11.8%	11.4%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	10.7%	10.9%	12.8%	11.9%	12.0%	13.8%	14.0%	8.5%	12.4%	11.1%	7.5%
General Fund FTEs:												
Average Annual Growth since FY 96..	NA	4.1%	5.9%	5.8%	7.1%	9.1%	10.3%	9.5%	8.6%	8.2%	8.2%	8.2%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	4.1%	7.8%	5.4%	11.1%	17.6%	16.3%	5.2%	2.3%	4.8%	8.8%	8.0%
Central Services Fund FTEs:												
Average Annual Growth since FY 96..	NA	39.0%	17.9%	11.6%	8.6%	10.9%	10.5%	8.9%	8.0%	6.4%	6.6%	6.0%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	39.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.6%	8.5%	0.0%	1.6%	-5.2%	8.1%	0.0%
Law Library Fund FTEs:												
Average Annual Growth since FY 96..	NA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total FTEs:												
Average Annual Growth since FY 96..	NA	8.3%	9.0%	9.4%	10.0%	10.7%	11.4%	11.3%	10.7%	10.6%	10.6%	10.3%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	8.3%	9.7%	10.2%	11.6%	13.8%	14.6%	10.9%	6.5%	9.9%	10.4%	7.6%
School Fund FTE per student (1).....	0.1174	0.1194	0.1209	0.1244	0.1261	0.1278	0.1337	0.1405	0.1404	0.1461	0.1508	0.1514
Average Annual Growth since FY 96.....	NA	1.7%	1.5%	1.9%	1.8%	1.7%	2.2%	2.6%	2.3%	2.5%	2.5%	2.3%
Annual Growth from Prior Year.....	NA	1.7%	1.3%	2.8%	1.4%	1.3%	4.6%	5.0%	0.0%	4.0%	3.3%	0.3%
(1) School FTE count only reflects School Board's Adopted Budget. The School FTE count may change once the School Board adopts the final School Budget.												
(2) General Government FTE count does not include State employees.												
FTE per capita: per 1,000												
School Fund.....	19.28	19.60	20.29	20.75	21.41	21.96	23.56	24.97	24.94	26.00	27.16	27.55
General Government.....	11.28	10.79	10.86	10.38	10.63	11.45	12.55	12.28	11.56	11.24	11.50	11.71
Central Services Fund.....	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05
Law Library Fund.....	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total FTEs per 1,000.....	30.62	30.47	31.22	31.19	32.10	33.48	36.18	37.31	36.56	37.29	38.71	39.31

# History of Expenditures by Department

Department	FY 03 Adopted	FY 03 Actual	FY 04 Adopted	FY 04 Actual
Boards, Commissions and Committees	\$1,763,000	\$2,203,220	\$1,787,000	\$2,135,894
County Administrator	2,251,000	2,052,747	2,091,000	2,008,628
Public Information	667,000	585,443	602,000	674,606
General Registrar	327,000	309,848	335,000	306,414
Regional Organizations & Contributions	2,904,000	2,853,711	3,086,000	3,065,308
County Attorney	1,462,000	4,593,071	1,683,000	3,460,465
Treasurer	2,930,000	2,657,938	2,938,000	2,872,204
Commissioner of the Revenue	2,013,000	1,887,692	2,057,000	1,876,026
Clerk of the Circuit Court	2,345,000	3,365,103	2,315,000	2,361,736
Commonwealth's Attorney	2,461,000	2,197,831	2,454,000	2,327,173
Sheriff	33,564,000	31,313,324	33,889,000	35,235,859
Management & Financial Services	10,370,000	9,307,073	10,153,000	9,276,405
Information Technology	12,174,000	13,201,262	12,190,000	13,805,858
General Services	19,495,000	18,741,272	17,138,000	21,333,668
Courts	911,000	750,918	892,000	803,349
Building and Development	14,730,000	13,795,139	15,331,000	14,816,397
Fire and Rescue Services	24,208,000	22,427,070	27,706,000	27,007,764
Planning Services	2,770,000	2,007,864	2,704,000	1,991,815
Economic Development	2,065,000	1,604,458	1,969,000	1,917,476
Office of Solid Waste Management	3,540,000	3,209,614	3,318,000	3,448,171
Office of Mapping & Geo. Info.	1,883,000	1,617,645	1,842,000	1,807,962
Animal Care and Control	1,840,000	1,537,401	1,717,000	1,565,736
Health Services	3,117,000	3,456,955	3,539,000	3,455,748
Transportation Services	3,473,000	3,704,109	3,961,000	4,289,088
Library Services	8,560,000	7,464,338	9,194,000	8,934,338
Community Corrections	956,000	818,328	945,000	848,572
Mental Health & Mental Retardation	20,412,000	18,873,765	20,658,000	19,707,629
Parks, Recreation & Community Services.	20,309,000	19,431,442	20,467,000	21,063,609
Juvenile Court Services Unit	907,000	834,536	1,057,000	1,057,461
Social Services	23,337,000	23,605,596	23,557,000	25,186,277
Extension Services	472,000	412,151	454,000	428,853
Miscellaneous	(4,540,000)	2,663,015	6,222,000	3,608,438
<b>General Government Subtotal</b>	<b>\$223,676,000</b>	<b>\$223,483,879</b>	<b>\$238,251,000</b>	<b>\$242,678,927</b>
<b>Schools</b>	<b>\$355,765,000</b>	<b>\$356,879,237</b>	<b>\$395,612,000</b>	<b>\$407,777,688</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$579,441,000</b>	<b>\$580,363,116</b>	<b>\$633,863,000</b>	<b>\$650,456,615</b>

SOURCE: Loudoun County FY 2007 Proposed Fiscal Plan, Executive Summary.

# History of Expenditures by Department - Continued

Department	FY 05 Adopted	FY 05 Actual	FY 06 Adopted	FY 07 Proposed
Boards, Commissions and Committees	\$2,155,000	\$2,404,671	\$2,272,000	\$2,382,000
County Administrator	2,136,000	2,178,178	2,599,000	3,045,000
Public Information	559,000	637,462	644,000	636,000
General Registrar	352,000	380,910	459,000	540,000
Regional Organizations & Contributions	3,481,000	3,474,269	4,308,000	4,422,000
County Attorney	1,661,000	2,175,617	1,906,000	2,067,000
Treasurer	2,983,000	2,993,689	3,235,000	3,523,000
Commissioner of the Revenue	2,102,000	1,841,247	2,296,000	2,311,000
Clerk of the Circuit Court	2,422,000	2,539,038	2,739,000	2,959,000
Commonwealth's Attorney	2,506,000	2,305,681	2,601,000	2,686,000
Sheriff	43,628,000	42,292,246	50,383,000	57,520,000
Management & Financial Services	9,673,000	10,687,766	12,140,000	13,006,000
Information Technology	12,195,000	13,580,808	14,822,000	16,497,000
General Services	16,453,000	19,360,778	20,199,000	23,795,000
Office of Capital Construction	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,251,000
County Courts	862,000	772,819	900,000	932,000
Building and Development	16,717,000	15,545,951	19,027,000	21,122,000
Fire and Rescue Services	29,582,000	29,571,822	34,411,000	39,909,000
Planning Services	2,328,000	2,001,846	2,487,000	2,894,000
Economic Development	1,605,000	1,818,849	1,840,000	1,859,000
Office of Solid Waste Management	3,440,000	3,476,397	3,694,000	4,554,000
Office of Mapping & Geo. Info.	1,653,000	1,824,308	1,802,000	2,008,000
Animal Care and Control	1,909,000	1,764,153	2,000,000	2,096,000
Health Services	3,653,000	3,512,415	3,855,000	3,950,000
Transportation Services	4,810,000	4,859,883	5,379,000	7,721,000
Library Services	9,533,000	9,433,194	10,360,000	10,812,000
Community Corrections	958,000	971,325	1,229,000	1,392,000
Mental Health & Mental Retardation	24,851,000	21,943,377	26,769,000	27,809,000
Parks, Recreation & Community Services.	22,278,000	22,284,574	25,268,000	28,271,000
Juvenile Court Services Unit	1,282,000	1,206,159	1,602,000	1,849,000
Social Services	26,924,000	27,222,079	28,539,000	30,402,000
Extension Services	487,000	465,984	503,000	528,000
Miscellaneous	4,044,000	5,362,136	1,236,000	8,153,000
<b>General Government Subtotal</b>	<b>\$259,222,000</b>	<b>\$260,889,631</b>	<b>\$291,504,000</b>	<b>\$334,901,000</b>
<b>Schools</b>	<b>\$462,217,000</b>	<b>\$484,015,462</b>	<b>\$537,542,000</b>	<b>\$629,762,000</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$721,439,000</b>	<b>\$744,905,093</b>	<b>\$829,046,000</b>	<b>\$964,663,000</b>

Note: Expenditures for County Government agencies comprise all operational expenditures including County special revenue funds.

**CPAM 2005-0003 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR THE UPPER BROAD RUN AND UPPER  
FOLEY TRANSITION SUBAREAS**

***Provide a list of the by-right communities and proffered communities that have been built in the Dulles South area since 1985.***

In the Dulles South area, approximately 41,456 dwelling units<sup>1</sup> have been approved or proposed to date in both by-right and proffered communities (*see Attachment Spreadsheet - Proposed and Approved Projects in the Dulles South Area – A large map of these projects will be provided at the May 22<sup>nd</sup> Planning Commission Worksession*).

**By-right Communities**

Sixteen by-right communities have been approved for a total of 2,048 dwelling units (all SFD). Of these approved units 634 are associated with an area that is the subject of an active rezoning application.

Thirteen by-right communities are proposed for a total of 2,583 dwelling units (all SFD). Of these proposed units 2,371 are associated with areas that are the subject of active rezoning applications.

**Proffered Communities**

Twenty-five proffered communities have been approved in the Dulles South area for a total of 14,889 dwelling units (6,161 SFD, 5,602 SFA, 3,126 MF).

Fifteen proffered communities have been proposed for a total of 21,936 dwelling units (7,402 SFD; 6,300 SFA; 8,234 MF). Of these proposed rezoning applications, 18,635 dwelling units (5,642 SFD, 5,431 SFA, 7,562 MF) are also the subject of approved or active by-right applications.

Developers in the Dulles South area have proffered right-of-way dedication, road construction, public school sites, parks, Affordable Dwelling Units (ADUs), and monetary contributions to the County government for the construction and/or operation of public facilities such as fire and rescue stations, roads and schools

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – Proposed and Approved Projects in the Dulles South Area

---

<sup>1</sup> Of the total 41,456 dwelling units, approximately 18,635 units are associated with active rezonings and 634 units and 2,371 units are associated with approved and active by-right applications respectively on the same parcels.

ATTACHMENT 1 - PROPOSED AND APPROVED PROJECTS IN THE DULLES SOUTH AREA (as of May 15, 2006)

Policy Area	Application Number	Application Name	Status	Built/Partially Built/Unbuilt as of 1/1/06*	Approved Residential Units			Proposed Residential Units			Approved Non-Residential (sf)			Proposed Non-Residential (sf)				
					SFD	SFA	MF	SFD	SFA	MF	Office	Retail	Industrial	Other**	Office	Retail	Industrial	Other**
RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS																		
Rezoning																		
Transition*	ZMAP 2005-0045	Arco/George Mason (See also SBPL 2005-0036)	Active	n/A				500	505	2,116					225,000**	95,000		1,500,000
Suburban	ZMAP 2000-0012	Blue Springs View	Approved	Unbuilt	120													
Suburban	ZMAP 2002-0020	Braddock Corner	Approved	Unbuilt	69	90												
Suburban	ZMAP 2003-0012	Braddock Crossing	Approved	Unbuilt	205													
Transition	ZMAP 2005-0005	Braddock South Village	Active	n/A				525	605	570						80,000	90,000	School site
Transition*	ZMAP 2005-0031	Braddock Village (See also SBPL 2004-0022 and SBPL 2004-0021)	Active	n/A				86	324	450								
Transition*	ZMAP 2005-0034	Broad Run Village (See also SBPL 2005-0043)	Active	n/A				1,229	1,489	1,595						52,000		5,000
Suburban	ZMAP 2005-0029	Caroline Chase	Active	n/A				26										
Suburban	ZMAP 2004-0009	Case Property	Approved	Unbuilt	1													
Suburban	ZMAP 2002-0003	CD Smith	Approved	Unbuilt	153	214	88											Unknown
Transition	ZMAP 2004-0022	Dawson's Corner	Approved	Unbuilt	224													
Suburban	ZMAP 2005-0008	Dean Property	Approved	Partially Built (45% Complete)	49													
Suburban	ZMAP 2004-0020	East Gate Rez (1)	Approved	Unbuilt		193	206											
Suburban	ZMAP 2005-0003	East Gate Rez (3)	Approved	Unbuilt			222											
Suburban	ZMAP 1999-0006	East Riding Estates (Bridle Ridge)	Approved	Unbuilt	45													
Suburban	ZMAP 2004-0008	Frontier Springs	Approved	Unbuilt	36	43												
Suburban	ZMAP 2003-0002	Greenfield Crossing	Approved	Unbuilt	16	91												
Transition*	SPEX 2005-0042	Greenfields	Active	n/A				1,894	1,404	2,569						79,000	280,000	
Suburban	ZMAP 2005-0016	Kimmitt Property	Active	n/A				49	55									
Suburban	ZMAP 1995-0014	Kirkpatrick Farm	Approved	Partially Built (27% Complete)	953	248	216											
Suburban	ZMAP 2002-0001	Kirkpatrick West	Approved	Unbuilt	171	66	134											
Transition*	ZMAP 2005-0033	Lenah (See also SBPL 2005-0044)	Active	n/A				574	702	648						74,000		
Transition	ZMAP 2005-0013	Marbury	Active	n/A				242		12								12,000
Suburban	ZMAP 2003-0004	Masira	Approved	Unbuilt	108	57												
Suburban	ZMAP 2001-0004	Pinebrook Village (Avonlea)	Approved	Partially Built (3% Complete)	65	343												
Suburban	ZMAP 1999-0022	Poland Road	Approved	Partially Built (48% Complete)	200													
Suburban	ZMAP 2002-0023	Providence Glen	Approved	Unbuilt	20	59												
Suburban	ZMAP 2005-0007	Reserve at South Riding (1)	Active	n/A					49									
Suburban	ZMAP 2005-0014	Reserve at South Riding (2)	Active	n/A				12	35									
Transition	ZMAP 2005-0001	Seven Hills	Active	n/A				870	58									
Suburban	ZMAP 1991-0005	South Riding	Approved	Partially Built (94% Complete)	2,415	2,200	1,100				1,180,000	494,500	36,500					
Suburban	ZMAP 2001-0010	South Riding Station	Approved	Unbuilt	274	346												
Suburban	ZMAP 1999-0016	South Village	Approved	Partially Built (87% Complete)	118	133												
Suburban	ZMAP 1994-0017	Stone Ridge (Combined with ZMAP 2002-0013)	Approved	Partially Built (36% Complete)	853	1,252	1,160				269,800	316,378	570,250	40,000				
Suburban	ZMAP 2002-0013	Stone Ridge (Combined with ZMAP 1994-0017)	Approved	n/A														
Suburban	ZMAP 2002-0022	Townes of East Gate	Approved	Unbuilt	57	267												
Suburban	ZMAP 2004-0019	Treburg	Active	n/A				36	11									
Transition*	ZMAP 2005-0030	Westport	Active	n/A				1,359	1,007	184						20,000	80,000	5,000
Suburban	ZMAP 2005-0044	Woodburn	Active	n/A					56	90								
Suburban	ZMAP 2005-0006	Wright Property	Approved	Unbuilt	9													
TOTAL					6,161	5,602	3,126	7,402	5,300	8,234	1,449,800	810,878	606,750	40,000	178,000	651,000	0	1,522,000

\* Information from the 2004 Annual Growth Summary.

\*\* Includes public facilities and churches.

\*\*\*If approved, the overall non-residential sf would be approximately 155,000 sf retail, 160,000 sf office, and 200,000 sf of light industrial

A18

Policy Area	Application Number	Application Name	Status	Built/Partially Built/Unbuilt as of 1/1/06*	Approved Residential Units			Proposed Residential Units			Approved Non-Residential (sf)			Proposed Non-Residential (sf)		
					SFD	SFA	MF	SFD	SFA	MF	Office	Retail	Industrial	Other**		
By-Right																
Transition*	SBPL 2004-0022	Aldie Estates, Phase 1 (See also ZMAP 2005-0031)	Active	n/A				29								
Transition*	SBPL 2004-0021	Aldie Estates, Phase 2 (See also ZMAP 2005-0031)	Active	n/A				59								
Transition*	SBPL 2005-0038	Arcola Property (See also ZMAP 2005-0045)	Active	n/A				383								
Suburban	SBRD 2005-0027	Baltzer Glen	Active	n/A				5								
Suburban	SBRD 2002-0081	Blue Spring Farm	Approved	Partially Built (96% Complete)	67											
Transition	SBPR 2005-0015	Bonniegayle Estates	Active	n/A				4								
Transition*	SBPL 2005-0043	Broad Run Village (See also ZMAP 2005-0034)	Active	n/A				410								
Transition	SBRD 2002-0102 & SBRD 2002-0114	Cedar Crest	Approved	Partially Built (83% Complete)	163											
Suburban	SBRD 2002-0109	Cedar Hunt	Approved	Partially Built (85% Complete)	244											
Suburban	SBPL 2003-0003	Elk Lick Road Property	Approved	Partially Built (96% Complete)	13											
Suburban	SBPL 2001-0017	Estates on Elk Run	Approved	Unbuilt	53											
Transition*	SBPL 2005-0041	Greenfields (See also ZMAP 2005-0032)	Active	n/A				675								
Suburban	SBPL 2002-0012	Hunter Property	Approved	Partially Built (96% Complete)	6											
Transition*	SBPL 2005-0044	Lenah (See also ZMAP 2005-0033)	Active	n/A				828								
Transition	SBPL 1998-0020	Lenah Run	Approved	Partially Built (94% Complete)	256											
Transition	SBPL 1999-0036	Marches, The	Approved	Partially Built (94% Complete)	32											
Transition	SBPL 2005-0007	Marwood at Stone Ridge	Active	n/A				115								
Suburban		Meadow Lane Sub	Approved	Unknown	19											
Suburban	SBPL 2000-0013	North Riding	Approved	Built	45											
Suburban	SBPL 2001-0054	Providence Ridge	Approved	Partially Built (83% Complete)	63											
Suburban	SBPL 2000-0047	Ridings at Blue Spring	Approved	Partially Built (92% Complete)	313											
Transition	SBPL 2005-0027	Rockbridge	Active	n/A				27								
Transition	SBRD 2004-0037	Rosapetry Estates	Active	n/A				21								
Suburban	SBRD 2000-0077	Savoy Woods Estates	Approved	Built	12											
Suburban	SBPL 2001-0009	Tall Cedar Estates	Approved	Partially Built (93% Complete)	70											
Transition*	SBPL 2004-0024	Westport (See also ZMAP 2005-0030)	Approved	Unbuilt	634											
Transition*	SBPL 2005-0034	Westport II (See also ZMAP 2005-0030)	Active	n/A				187								
Suburban	SBPL 2000-0006	Westview Estates	Approved	Partially Built	58											
Suburban	SBRD 2005-0021	Winbury	Active	n/A				40								
TOTAL					2,048	0	0	2,583	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

A19

\* Information from the 2004 Annual Growth Summary.

\*\* Includes public facilities and churches.

\*\*\*If approved, the overall non-residential sf would be approximately 155,000 sf retail, 160,000 sf office, and 200,000 sf of light industrial

Policy Area	Application Number	Application Name	Status	Built/Partially Built/Unbuilt as of 1/1/06*	Approved Residential Units			Proposed Residential Units			Approved Non-Residential (sf)				Proposed Non-Residential (sf)			
					SFD	SFA	MF	SFD	SFA	MF	Office	Retail	Industrial	Other*	Office	Retail	Industrial	Other**
NON-RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS																		
Rezoning																		
Suburban	SPEX 1985-0300, SPEX 1981-0180 SPEX 2000-0026	All Pets Animal Hospital, Loudoun Sports Car Center American Land Cycle Inc	Approved Active	Built n/A							No sf	No sf						
Suburban	ZMAP 2005-0035	Arcola Center (See also ZMAP 1998-0004 and ZMAP 1997-0004)**	Active	n/A											1,620,000	1,100,000	550,000	
Suburban*	ZMAP 1998-0004	Arcola Center at Hutchinson Farm (See also ZMAP 2005-0035)**	Approved	Unbuilt							200,000	811,500						
Suburban	ZMAP 2004-0005	Avonlea Plaza	Active	n/A														
Suburban	SPEX 2002-0013	Cadnor Center	Approved	Built								99,000				300,000		
Transition (Lower Foley)	ZMAP 2004-0011 & SPEX 2004-0001	Catholic High School	Approved	Unbuilt														
Suburban	SPEX 1998-0038	CC Johnson Mulch Facility	Approved	Unbuilt											353,800			
Suburban	SPEX 2002-0004	Charlity Pres. Church	Approved	Unbuilt										no sf				
Suburban	ZMAP 2003-0010, SPEX 2003-0015	Commonwealth Construction Management, Inc.	Approved	Unbuilt											30,190			
Suburban	SPEX 1986-0210	Concraft Supply Inc	Approved	Built										no sf				
Suburban	ZMAP 2004-0026	Dulles Landing	Active	n/A							4,000	2,000	16,000					
Suburban	ZMAP 2005-0002	East Gate Rez (2)	Approved	Unbuilt							62,100	140,848				728,000		
Suburban	SPEX 1982-0330	Freddie's Mini-Mart	Approved	Built														
Suburban	SPEX 2003-0003	Gum Spring Village Center	Approved	Unbuilt								56,000						
Suburban*	ZMAP 1997-0004	Hazout at Hutchinson Farm (See also ZMAP 2005-0035)**	Approved	Unbuilt											1,871,000			
Suburban	SPEX 2005-0040, STPL 1998-0035	Holtzman Oil, Mountairprize Inc	Active, Approved	n/A, Unbuilt														
Suburban	SPEX 1981-0110	K Kennels	Approved	Built								2,989				9,184		
Suburban	SPEX 1997-0022	Loudoun Composting	Approved	Unbuilt														
Suburban	SPEX 2004-0002	Main Street Project	Approved	Unbuilt														
Suburban	SPEX 1982-0040	Oil Supply Company	Approved	Built							22,900	25,450					32,500	
Suburban*	SPEX 1991-0050	Pleasant Valley Golf Driving Range (See also SBPL 2005-0046)	Approved	Built														
Suburban	SPEX 1984-0480	Pleasant Valley Kennel	Approved	Built														
Suburban	SPEX 1990-0050	Pleasant Valley United Methodist Church	Approved	Built											7,870			
Suburban	SPEX 2005-0047	Pleasant Valley Village	Active	n/A														
Suburban	SPEX 2004-0016	Roya Property	Active	n/A				3								75,348		
Suburban	SPEX 1983-0230	Wood Warehouse/Storage	Approved	Built										No sf	9,000			
TOTAL					0	0	0	3	0	0	289,000	1,137,787	1,887,000	391,860	1,629,000	2,212,532	582,500	0

**A20**

\* Information from the 2004 Annual Growth Summary.

\*\* Includes public facilities and churches.

\*\*\*If approved, the overall non-residential sf would be approximately 155,000 sf retail, 160,000 sf office, and 200,000 sf of light industrial

Policy Area	Application Number	Application Name	Status	Built/Partially Built/Unbuilt as of 1/1/06*	Approved Residential Units			Proposed Residential Units			Approved Non-Residential (sf)			Proposed Non-Residential (sf)				
					SFD	SFA	MF	SFD	SFA	MF	Office	Retail	Industrial	Other*	Office	Retail	Industrial	Other**
By-Right																		
Suburban	STPL 1999-0050	A&A Transfer	Approved															
Suburban	STPL 2005-0080	Ariana & Hammond Center	Active	n/A									no sf			44,000		
Suburban	STPL 1997-0010	Crescent/Krause	Approved	Unbuilt												44,000		
Suburban	STPL 1994-0002	Dubrock Concrete Phase A	Approved											18,000				
Suburban*	SBPL 2005-0046	East Gate Assemblage (See also SPEX 1991-0050)	Active	n/A										55,450				
Suburban	STPL 2005-0061	Epic at Dulles South	Active	n/A													10 lots	
Suburban	STPL 2000-0028	KT Enterprises Route 50 Facility	Approved	Built							10,000	8,400					185,759	
Suburban	STPL 2000-0043	Long Fence Company	Approved	Built														
Suburban	SPPF 1994-0006	MC Dean Electrical Contracting	Approved	Built										32,500				
Suburban	STPL 1996-0006	MC Dean Electrical Contracting	Active	n/A										25,600				
Suburban	STPL 1998-0064	Sheetz	Approved	Built									4,045				10,800	
Suburban	STPL 2002-0028	South Riding Market Square	Approved	Partially Built							98,000	269,965						
Suburban	STPL 2005-0085	Woodburn Office Park	Active	n/A														
Suburban	STPL 2001-0117	Zimmerman Property	Approved	Unbuilt							10,000					88,000		
TOTAL					0	0	0	0	0	0	118,000	282,410	151,550	0	176,000	0	196,559	0

By-right and rezoning applications being reviewed simultaneously.

\* By-right and rezoning applications being reviewed simultaneously

\*\* Approved rezoning and active rezoning application

A21

\* Information from the 2004 Annual Growth Summary.

\*\* Includes public facilities and churches.

\*\*\*If approved, the overall non-residential sf would be approximately 155,000 sf retail, 160,000 sf office, and 200,000 sf of light industrial

**CPAM 2005-0003 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR THE UPPER BROAD RUN AND UPPER  
FOLEY TRANSITION SUBAREAS**

***Provide an overview of Lenah Run and the Marches subdivisions to include site plans and special features and highlights of the developments.***

Two by-right communities have been developed in the Upper Broad Run subareas – Lenah Run (consisting of 255 homes) and The Marches (consisting of 32 homes). Information regarding these two developments has been provided below and in the attached plats.

In addition to Lenah Run and The Marches, three other by-right communities are proposed within the Transition Policy Area (Marrwood at Stone Ridge, SBPL 2005-0007, Rockbridge (SBPL 2005-0027), and Rosspriority Estates, SBRD 2004-0037). Four rezonings have also been approved that are partially within the Transition Policy Area and partially within the Suburban Policy Area, including Braddock Crossing (ZMAP 2003-0012), Kirkpatrick West (ZMAP 2002-0001), CD Smith (ZMAP 2002-0003), and Stone Ridge (ZMAP 2002-0013). In addition, there are several by-right and rezoning applications that are currently active within the Transition Policy Area on the same parcels, including Aldie Estates, Phases 1 and 2 (SBPL 2004-0022 and SBPL 2004-0021) and Braddock Village (ZMAP 2005-0031); Arcola Property (SBPL 2005-0038) and Arcola/George Mason (ZMAP 2005-0045) partially within the Suburban Policy Area; Broad Run Village (SBPL 2005-0043) and Broad Run Village (ZMAP 2005-0034); Greenfields (SBPL 2005-0041) and Greenfields (ZMAP 2005-0032); Lenah (SBPL 2005-0044) and Lenah (ZMAP 2005-0033); and the approved Westport application (SBPL 2004-0024) and proposed Westport II (SBPL 2005-0034) and Westport (ZMAP 2005-0030).

**Lenah Run, SBPL 1998-0020 (Approved in 1999)**

Lenah Run is located in the Upper Broad Run subarea of the Transition Policy Area. This community consists of 255 single family detached houses in a cluster/hamlet pattern on approximately 460 acres of land at an overall density of 1 du/1.8 acres. Almost half of the total acreage preserved is open space. The average lot size in Lenah Run is approximately half an acre. Community facilities include a community pool, bath house, and trails. Lenah Run is approximately 94% built out; as of January 1, 2006, 240 of the total 255 dwelling units have been built or permitted.

**The Marches, SBPL 1999-0036 (Approved in 2000)**

The Marches is located in the Upper Broad Run subarea of the Transition Policy Area. It consists of 32 single family detached houses on approximately 121 acres of land at an overall density of 1 du/3.8 acres. The individual lots range in size from 1 to 2+ acres. The Marches is approximately 94% built out; as of January 1, 2006, 30 of the total 32 dwelling units have been built or permitted.

**ATTACHMENT 4**



**Lenah Run**

**The Marches**

**CPAM 2005-0003 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR THE UPPER BROAD RUN AND UPPER  
FOLEY TRANSITION SUBAREAS**

***Information and/or request to provide recent studies associated with farm pollution.***

Crop and livestock production can harm the quality of water resources. Activities that can contribute to water pollution include confined animal facilities, grazing, plowing, pesticide spraying, irrigation, fertilizing, planting, and harvesting. The major agricultural pollutants that result from these activities are sediment and siltation, nutrients, pesticides, salinity, and pathogens. Agricultural activities also can damage habitat and stream channels.

According to the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) National Water Quality Inventory, runoff from agricultural lands, municipal point sources (sewage treatment plants), and hydrological modifications (such as channelization, flow regulation, and dredging) are the primary sources of impairment. More specifically, agriculture is the leading source of impairment in rivers (contributing to impairment of 25 percent of the surveyed river miles), lakes (19 percent of lake acres, not including the Great Lakes), and the fifth leading source of impairment to estuaries (10 percent of surveyed estuary acres).

The segment of Bull Run that forms the boundary between Loudoun County and Prince William County was assessed as "good" in 2002 in the National Assessment Database, meaning that it met all the uses for which it was assessed. Other segments of Bull Run downstream of Loudoun County were assessed as "threatened" (meaning that it met all assessed uses but water quality conditions appeared to be declining) and "impaired" (meaning that one or more of its assessed uses was not met).

There are several federal and state agencies that offer assistance to the farm community to reduce pollution, including the USDA Farm Service Agency and Natural Resources Conservation Service, the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation, Virginia Cooperative Extension, Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, and the Virginia Department of Forestry.

**Attachments**

Attachment 1 – Water Quality Conditions in the United States; A Profile from the 2000 National Water Quality Inventory. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2002.

Attachment 2 – America's Animal Factories: How States Fail to Prevent Pollution from Livestock Waste (Virginia). National Resources Defense Council, 2005.

Prepared by the Loudoun County Department of Planning, May 18, 2006



# Water Quality Conditions in the United States

## A Profile from the 2000 National Water Quality Inventory



*In 2000, states, tribes, territories, and interstate commissions report that about 40% of streams, 45% of lakes, and 50% of estuaries that were assessed were not clean enough to support uses such as fishing and swimming (Figure 1). About 33% of U.S. waters were assessed for this national inventory of water quality. Leading causes of impairment in assessed waters include bacteria, nutrients, metals (primarily mercury), and siltation (Figure 2). Runoff from agricultural lands, municipal point sources (sewage treatment plants), and hydrologic modifications (such as channelization, flow regulation, and dredging) are the primary sources of impairment. Although the United States has made significant progress in cleaning up polluted waters over the past 30 years, much remains to be done to restore and protect the nation's waters.*

### Background

This fact sheet summarizes the findings of the *National Water Quality Inventory: 2000 Report*, prepared under Section 305(b) of the Clean Water Act. Section 305(b) requires that states, territories, and jurisdictions assess their water quality biennially and report those findings to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). EPA then summarizes the findings in a national water quality inventory. It is important to note that this report is no longer a Report to Congress, pursuant to Public Law 104-66, the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995.

To assess water quality, states and other jurisdictions compare their monitoring results to the water quality standards they have set for their waters. Water quality standards consist of three elements: the designated uses assigned to waters (such as drinking, swimming, or fishing), criteria to protect those uses (such as chemical-specific thresholds that should not be exceeded), and an antidegradation policy intended to




keep waters that do meet standards from deteriorating from their current condition.

### Findings

In their 2000 reports, states, tribes, territories, and other jurisdictions assessed approximately 700,000 miles of rivers and 17.34 million acres of lakes, slightly less area than in their 1998 reports. This decrease is largely due to the states' growing reluctance to use older qualitative data when making water quality assessments. More often, states are choosing to use only high quality monitoring data for the purpose of these assessments. States assessed about 31,000 square miles of estuaries, slightly more than in the last reporting cycle. Figures 1 and 2 summarize the quality of assessed river miles, lake acres, and estuary square miles.

In 2000, mercury was described as a leading cause of impairment in the nation's estuaries and lakes. Increasingly, states are moving toward more comprehensive

**Figure 1. Summary of Quality of Assessed Rivers, Lakes, and Estuaries**

Waterbody Type	Total Size	Amount Assessed* (% of Total)	Good (% of Assessed)	Good but Threatened (% of Assessed)	Polluted (% of Assessed)
 Rivers (miles)	3,692,830	699,946 (19%)	367,129 (53%)	59,504 (8%)	269,258 (39%)
 Lakes (acres)	40,603,893	17,339,080 (43%)	8,026,988 (47%)	1,348,903 (8%)	7,702,370 (45%)
 Estuaries (sq. miles)	87,369	31,072 (36%)	13,850 (45%)	1,023 (<4%)	15,676 (51%)

\*Includes waterbodies assessed as not attainable for one or more uses.

Note: percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

A28

Figure 2. Leading Causes and Sources\* of Impairment in Assessed Rivers, Lakes, and Estuaries

	Rivers and Streams	Lakes, Ponds, and Reservoirs	Estuaries
Causes	Pathogens (Bacteria)	Nutrients	Metals (Primarily mercury)
	Siltation (Sedimentation)	Metals (Primarily mercury)	Pesticides
	Habitat Alterations	Siltation (Sedimentation)	Oxygen-Depleting Substances
Sources	Agriculture	Agriculture	Municipal Point Sources
	Hydrologic Modifications	Hydrologic Modifications	Urban Runoff/Storm Sewers
	Habitat Modifications	Urban Runoff/Storm Sewers	Industrial Discharges

\*Excluding unknown, natural, and "other" sources.

examination of fish tissue and are issuing statewide advisories that restrict the consumption of some fish, especially for vulnerable segments of the population. Mercury, which originates from air transport from power-generating facilities and incinerators, mining, natural rock weathering, and other sources, was cited in 2,242 of the 2,838 fishing advisories reported by the states in 2000.

In addition, the states, tribes, territories, and jurisdictions assessed the quality of ocean and Great Lakes shoreline miles, wetlands, and ground water.

- Of the assessed ocean shoreline miles, 14% are impaired, primarily because of bacteria, oxygen depletion, and turbidity. Primary sources of pollution include urban runoff, storm sewers, nonpoint source runoff, and land disposal of wastes. States assessed only 6% of the nation's ocean shoreline miles.
- States also found that 78% of assessed Great Lakes shoreline miles are impaired, primarily due to pollutants in fish tissue at levels that exceed standards to protect human health. States assessed 92% of Great Lakes shoreline miles.
- The average annual loss of wetlands has decreased over the past 40 years to a current estimated loss of 58,500 acres per year. Nine states and tribes listed sources of recent wetland loss. Leading reasons for loss are filling and draining, conversion for agricultural uses, residential development, and road construction.
- Overall, the states found that ground water quality is good and can support many different uses. However, measurable negative impacts have been detected in some areas and are commonly traced back to sources such as leaking underground storage tanks, septic systems, and landfills.

## Future Reporting

In an effort to improve the consistency and comprehensiveness of water quality reporting and to streamline the reporting process, EPA is providing states, territories, and tribes with guidance that recommends they submit a *2002 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report* to satisfy the requirements for both Sections 305(b) and 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (Section 303(d) requires states to identify impaired waters and develop allocations of the maximum amount of a pollutant each impaired water can receive and still meet water quality standards). The guidance is available at <http://www.epa.gov/owow/tmdl/2002wqma.html>. EPA anticipates that the development of an *Integrated Report* will benefit the public by providing a clearer summary of the water quality status of the nation's waters and the management actions necessary to protect and restore them. The *Integrated Report* will also enhance the ability of water quality managers to display, access, and integrate environmental data and information from all components of the water quality program.

## For Further Information

For a copy of the *National Water Quality Inventory: 2000 Report* (EPA-841-R-02-001), visit [www.epa.gov/305b](http://www.epa.gov/305b) or call the EPA's National Service Center for Environmental Publications at 1-800-490-9198.

United States Environmental Protection Agency  
Office of Water (4503F)  
EPA-841-F-02-003 • August 2002

A29



NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL

SEARCH

Go

DONATE AND HELP SAVE THE PLANET

TAKE ACTION

SUBSCRIBE

EMAIL THIS ARTICLE



Clean Water &amp; Oceans: Water Pollution: In Depth: Report

- Clean Water & Oceans
  - Drinking Water
  - Water Pollution
    - In Brief
    - In Depth
    - Related Links
- Oceans
- Conservation & Restoration

## America's Animal Factories

### How States Fail to Prevent Pollution from Livestock Waste

[Top of Report](#)

#### Chapter 27

## VIRGINIA

- Hog factory farms in Virginia are expanding and are regulated too leniently.
- Virginia's poultry operations, which produce more than one billion pounds a year of manure, are unregulated.

Hog factory feedlots are an emerging problem in Virginia. Citizens and environmental organizations are working to develop regulatory controls before pollution problems become more severe. Currently, Virginia has issued 72 permits for feedlots that have more than 750 swine or 200 dairy cattle. Fifty-two of these permits are for swine operations; 20 are for dairy facilities. A few of the swine facilities also have some confined beef cattle. Only a few poultry operations classified as "layer" facilities have permits.<sup>1</sup> The remaining poultry feedlots are unregulated.

Aided by studies by Virginia Tech and a welcome by Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services officials, the hog industry is targeting the "southside" of Virginia,<sup>2</sup> the area of the state south of Richmond and reaching west from the Tidewater area to Danville in south-central Virginia. This is a rural, economically depressed area, making it vulnerable to the lure of jobs and tax dollars presented by factory-scale farms seeking as little regulation as possible. Environmentalists fear that Virginia's lax regulatory environment could attract hog operators from neighboring North Carolina,<sup>3</sup> which last year adopted toughened regulations for hog factory farms.

Southern Virginia has many rivers and streams that are susceptible to pollution. Two regions of the state with active factory-scale farming are particularly vulnerable to groundwater contamination from animal waste: the southside of Virginia because of its high water table and the Shenandoah Valley because of its karst topography -- a type of geology characterized by a porous limestone layer just above groundwater.

## Pollution Problems

A30



Virginia's more than 1,300 unregulated poultry operations produce more than one billion pounds of manure each year from more than 280 million birds.<sup>4</sup> The chicken droppings, known as "litter," generated by Virginia's poultry industry have a nutrient content equivalent to the human sewage from 1,800 towns of 6,000 people each. In Virginia's Shenandoah and Potomac River basins alone, poultry produces one and a half times as much nutrient pollution as is generated by human waste in the same area.<sup>5</sup>

Researchers at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University calculate that poultry farmers annually generate 159,000 tons more poultry waste than can be properly applied to the land in certain areas.<sup>6</sup> Applying more waste to farmland than the crops can safely take-up inevitably contributes to polluted runoff into nearby bodies of water.

Years of data indicate that animal waste has polluted rivers and streams favored for recreation and contaminated drinking water supplies from groundwater and surface water. In fact, Virginia has classified 712 miles of state waters as "impaired" due to diffuse sources of agricultural pollution.<sup>7</sup> According to Virginia Tech, "Soils in some parts of the Shenandoah Valley contain as much as eight times the phosphorus needed by crops, the result of years of over-application."<sup>8</sup> On Virginia's Eastern Shore, close to one third of the nitrogen and two-fifths of the phosphorus nutrients entering the Chesapeake from that region are attributed to animal waste pollution.<sup>9</sup>

In order to cope with the manure produced by 2,700 hogs -- the most common size for Virginia's confined feeding operations -- operators generally store the waste in one or more manure lagoons at each facility. Leaks and overflows from these lagoons have occurred, threatening some of Virginia's most environmentally vulnerable regions. In the early 1990s, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) inspection reports documented several waste overflows from hog houses and a manure lagoon at Smithfield-Carroll's Farms' hog factory in Surry County. The reports cited signs that some of the waste discharged had reached state waters. However, no enforcement action was taken. Inspections at a number of other hog operations have revealed evidence of improper disposal of manure. In one instance, a Virginia Beach hog feedlot constructed in a wetlands area was supposed to ship its waste to another site. Instead, the waste was left next to the wetlands where rainwater washed polluted runoff into the environmentally fragile area.<sup>10</sup>

## Regulatory Climate

Despite the increasing number of poultry operations in the state and the substantial potential for these operations to harm water quality, poultry facilities remain unregulated. The rationale is that poultry facilities generate dry litter and therefore pose no threat of polluted liquid discharge to state waters. In reality, the waste generated by poultry farms poses significant threats to water quality. Poultry litter, left uncovered or applied to land as fertilizer, can wash into rivers and streams during rainstorms and contribute to nutrient pollution of waterways if it is spread too generously, or at inappropriate times.

Until 1993, the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) issued site-specific permits to hog, beef and dairy operations. Because it took 12 to 18 months to permit an operation, large producers criticized the system as too burdensome, and lobbied successfully for a weaker general permit system.<sup>11</sup> During the 1998 session of the Virginia General Assembly the general permit system was strengthened slightly. The new regulations under the law become effective December 1, 1998.<sup>12</sup>

A major weakness of the general permit authorized under the 1998 law is its one-size-fits-all approach to environmental regulation. Although larger operations obviously have more potential to pollute state waters than do smaller ones, the law treats them the same, whether they contain 750 hogs or 50,000 hogs. Under the new legislation, DEQ will continue to issue general permits for all feeding operations of 300 or more animal units -- equivalent to 300 beef cattle, 200 mature dairy cattle, 750 swine weighing over 55 pounds,

A31

150 horses or 3,000 sheep. Under the permit, an operator must file a registration statement describing the facility and include a letter of approval from the state Department of Conservation and Recreation for a nutrient management plan for handling animal waste.<sup>13</sup>

Another major weakness of the new general permit is its failure to address the phosphorus content in manure. Even though most crops require much less phosphorus than nitrogen, both nutrients found in fertilizers and manure, waste management plans typically base their recommendations for manure-spreading on manure's nitrogen content. This approach can over-enrich soil with phosphorus and lead to the pollution of nearby waterways.

The state's 1998 legislation requires that all facilities greater than 300 animal units must be registered by July 1, 2000.<sup>14</sup> According to research by the Virginia office of the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, a significant number of hog facilities were not registered and are operating without a general permit. Also, prior to the 1998 legislation, there was a loophole that did not require nutrient management plans (NMPs) for facilities continuing to operate under an individual permit. The new law closed that loophole and now facilities with individual permits will need NMPs.<sup>15</sup>

The new program fails to require buffer zones to separate animal waste lagoons from adjoining neighbors, groundwater, streams and rivers. Some minimum buffers are mandated, however, between fields sprayed with manure and occupied dwellings, wells and surface water. Under the new amendments passed by the General Assembly, the lagoon design and construction must be certified by a professional engineer prior to startup.<sup>16</sup>

Under the system used prior to the new legislation DEQ was required to inspect operations once every five years. DEQ claimed to inspect annually, but the inspections were inadequate since inspectors from DEQ had not been trained in the operation of nutrient management plans. The new legislation provides for annual inspections, requires that DEQ personnel be trained in nutrient management and requires farm operators to be trained in all aspects of CAFO management.<sup>17</sup>

Historically, the general permit system has allowed no opportunity for the public to comment on permits prior to issuance. Counties were notified of permit applications, but only to check if a livestock operation met zoning requirements; there was no requirement that the county notify citizens. The recently-enacted legislation requires that notice be given to adjoining landowners prior to construction or permit issuance and that the public have the opportunity to comment. Citizens can also comment on an enforcement order if they learn about it through the newspaper.<sup>18</sup>

The state has minimal monitoring requirements. The general permit requires livestock operators to monitor animal waste every year and the soil every three years for nutrient content. As an alternative to prohibiting manure lagoons in areas with high water tables, the general permit requires groundwater monitoring at facilities where the bottom of the lagoon is constructed within one foot of the seasonable high water table. Under the new law, DEQ and the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation may increase the frequency of monitoring if they deem it necessary. However, the new law still does not require monitoring reports to be submitted to DEQ. All records are the property of the farmer and therefore are not subject to Freedom of Information Act requests. DEQ does not monitor air quality.<sup>19</sup>

Despite spotty enforcement of the general permit program, problems have been identified. For example, this past winter, the State Water Control Board took action against SJB Farms in connection with one of its hog feedlots in Brunswick County. The DEQ found that SJB Farms violated the requirements of its nutrient management plan by over-applying 2,000 gallons per acre more of liquid manure than was allowed under the plan. DEQ also found that liquid manure was to have been applied to soybeans on another site, but soybeans had not been planted. In a consent agreement with the state that admitted no responsibility, SJB Farms paid only a \$3,000 fine for these problems.<sup>20</sup> A consent order in September 1998 imposed a mere \$1,000 fine on a separate Southampton County hog feedlot that had situated a discharge pipe at its manure pond so that swine waste from the pond reached

A32

state waters.<sup>21</sup>

## Local Control

Several counties have passed strict zoning ordinances specifically aimed at animal feedlots. Brunswick County, which enacted the strictest ordinance, has been sued by two large hog producers, Smithfield-Carroll and SJB Farms, on the grounds that its zoning violates Virginia's Right to Farm Act, a law aimed at protecting farmers.<sup>22</sup>

### Primary interviewees for this chapter:

Kay Slaughter  
Southern Environmental Law Center  
201 West Main Street, Suite 14  
Charlottesville, VA 22902  
Phone: 804-977-4090  
Fax: 804-977-1483  
e-mail: kslaughter@selcva.org

Jeff Corbin Chesapeake Bay Foundation  
1001 East Main Street, Suite 710  
Richmond, VA 23219  
Phone: 804-780-1392  
Fax: 804-648-4011  
e-mail: jcorbin@savethebay.cbf.org

---

### Notes

1. Southern Environmental Law Center, information received under Virginia Freedom of Information Act; request to Richard Ayers, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality.
2. Letter to unnamed swine company from Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (November 17, 1995); Suzanne Thornsby, et al., *The Economic Impact of Increased Swine Production in a Rural Virginia County*, Virginia's Rural Economic Analysis Program, Department of Agricultural Economics, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Virginia Tech; Lauren Harper, et al., *The Financial Feasibility of Finishing Feeder Pigs Under Production Contract in Virginia*, Virginia's Rural Economic Analysis Program, Department of Agricultural Economics, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Virginia Tech.
3. Tim Davis, "Huge Hog Farm Eyes County Site," *Star Tribune* (July 2, 1997).
4. Chesapeake Bay Foundation, "The Need to Regulate Poultry: What Science and the Experts Say" Fact Sheet.
5. Based on calculations from: Minority Staff, U.S. Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, *Animal Waste Pollution in America: An Emerging Problem*, Washington D.C. (December 1997).
6. Presentations by Dr. James Pease, Dr. Marcus Alley, and Dr. Saied Mostghimi, Virginia Tech College of Agriculture and Life Sciences on the Relationships between Poultry Production and Water Quality, Senate Committee on Agriculture, Conservation and Senate Committee on Agriculture, Conservation and Natural Resources, Special Subcommittee Studying HB 1207, Richmond, Virginia (September 22, 1998).
7. Virginia Department of Environmental Quality and Department of Conservation and Recreation, "303 (d) Total Maximum Daily Load Priority List and Report" (1998), Table 2.

A33



8. Chesapeake Bay Foundation, "The Need to Regulate Poultry: What Science and the Experts Say" Fact Sheet.

9. Chesapeake Bay Foundation, "The Need to Regulate Poultry: What Science and the Experts Say" Fact Sheet.

10. Southern Environmental Law Center, information received under Virginia Freedom of Information Act; request to Richard Ayers, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality.

11. David Kenyon, "Developing Permits: A Virginia Case Study for Confined Animal Feeding Operations," Virginia Cooperative Extension Publication 448-225/Reap RO27 (1997).

12. Virginia Code section 62.1-44.17:1.

13. Virginia Code section 62.1-44.17:1.

14. Virginia Code section 62.1-44.17.1.

15. Virginia Code section 62.1-44.17.1.

16. Virginia Code section 62.1-44.17.1.

17. Virginia Code section 62.1-44.17.1.

18. Virginia Code section 62.1-44.17.1.

19. Virginia Code section 62.1-44.17.1.

20. Consent Order between SJB and Virginia State Water Quality Control Board (February 5, 1998).

21. Notice of Proposed Consent Special Order, J.R. Newsome, Jr. Hog Farm, Virginia Register of Regulations (August 17, 1998), p. 3972 and copy of consent order from Tidewater Region, Department of Environmental Quality, Virginia Beach, Virginia.

22. Sidney J. Brandon, Jr. and SJB Farms, Inc. v. Brunswick County and Board of Supervisors of Brunswick County, #CH97-78 and Carroll's Foods of Virginia, Inc. v. Brunswick County, Virginia and Board of Supervisors of Brunswick County, #CH97-77.

[Home](#) | [About Us](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Multimedia](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Site Map](#)

© Natural Resources Defense Council

A34

CPAM 2005-0003 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR THE UPPER BROAD RUN AND UPPER  
FOLEY TRANSITION SUBAREAS

*Why and how has the proposed George Mason University Loudoun County campus come about? What excited the University about the proposed site in Loudoun?*

George Mason University is proposing a new campus in Loudoun County on 123 acres of land located near the intersection of Route 50 and Route 659 Relocated. The expansion, according to University President Alan Merten, addresses a growing demand in Loudoun County for higher education and enhances George Mason University's own "distributed university" concept in Northern Virginia.

The property is being donated to the university by Greenvest LLC, a Virginia developer. Greenvest has submitted an application (ZMAP 2005-0045, Arcola/George Mason University) which includes, among other things, the George Mason University campus. According to the application, the campus is proposed to consist of up to 1.5 million square feet, which includes 650,000 square feet of education and general (e.g., academic) uses, 450,000 square feet of non education and general uses (i.e., student housing, recreation, performing arts, etc.), and 400,000 square feet of additional unprogrammed capacity.

George Mason's upcoming plans for Loudoun County include:

- Offering undergraduate degree programs;
- Offering graduate-level programs in such areas as technology and management, teacher training, health professional training, and public administration;
- Conducting research in medical imaging, biotechnology, and clinical trials; and
- Providing training and research in air transportation.

On September 6, 2005, Tom Hennessey of George Mason University, Jim Duszynski of Greenvest, and Alan Merten, President of George Mason University addressed the Board of Supervisors regarding this proposal.

**Sources:**

Banks, Rey. September 7, 2005. George Mason Plans to Open New Campus in Loudoun by 2009 *in*: The Mason Gazette.

Greenvest, LLC. ZMAP 2005-0045, Arcola/George Mason University Concept Development Plan, February 3, 2006.

Prepared by the Loudoun County Department of Planning, May 18, 2006

***Provide a review of the 1992 DSAMP memo regarding Capital Facilities Needs Assessment and include a discussion of projections and major features in light of what has actually occurred. That is, what was expected to happen in 1992 and what has actually happened today. Highlight any major shifts that have occurred since 1992.***

The Planning Commission references a memo to the Dulles South Planning Area Citizens' Advisory Committee entitled "Dulles South Planning Area Capital Facilities Improvements Needs Assessment and Cost Analysis". What follows is a brief synopsis of the projections and standards that went into developing the capital cost and where possible, a comparison of the 1992 projections and current growth and standards.

### **Projections**

The 1992 DSAMP proposed Low Density Residential areas recommending up to 3 dwellings per acre (Upper Foley) and Moderate Density Residential areas up to 6 dwellings per acre (Upper Broad Run). Densities up to 24 dwellings per acre were permitted in the Business Community.

The DSAMP area covers 25,000 acres that in 1992 housed 600-700 families. The Plan projected a residential build out of 44,300 units. The Plan assumed 5,200 new units by 2010 and 11,400 new units by 2020.

<b>1992 DSAMP Build Out Projections</b>			
<b>Unit Type</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Total Population</b>	<b>Students</b>
Detached	20,583	53,526	12,584
Attached	15,509	40,634	5,584
Multi-family	11,078	21,934	1,661
<b>Totals</b>	<b>44,310</b>	<b>116,094</b>	<b>19,829</b>

By 2005, sixteen by-right communities have been approved for a total of 2,048 dwelling units (all SFD). Twenty-five proffered communities have been approved in the Dulles South area for 14,889 dwelling units (6,161 SFD, 5,602 SFA, and 3,126 MF). The total number of approved units in Dulles South is 16,937. From 1995 to 2005, 9,635 building permits were issued.

The 1992 fiscal analysis also projected 9,300 new jobs by 2010 and 19,600 by 2020 based on 5,000,000 square feet and 10,500,000 square feet of employment floor area respectively. Approximately 3.4 million square feet of office, retail and industrial space is located in Dulles South.

A 36

## Capital Facilities Standards

The County's capital facility standards are based on population and number of students. Consequently the size of households is an accurate tracking tool made possible by the school census process. The persons per household and student per household figures have remained fairly stable since 1992:

Household Population				
Unit/	1992	2005	1992	2005
Detached	3.02	3.13	.79	.80
Attached	2.62	2.64	.43	.42
Multi-family	1.98	1.90	.21	.21

The County services included in the 1992 capital facilities analysis are attached with the 1992 Memo to the Dulles South Planning Area Citizens' Advisory Committee (Attachment 1). The current Adopted Capital Facilities Standards (Attachment 2) allows some comparisons. Notable differences between the capital facilities needs in 1992 and the current needs include:

1. In 1992, \$102,000,000 was the anticipated cost of solid waste management. Currently there is no solid waste category.
2. In 1992, Parks and Recreation facilities were listed individually and included the now infamous archery ranges, equestrian trails and picnic tables, among others. Currently, parks and recreation facilities are defined by three park sizes: District, Regional, and Community and by Recreation Center.
3. In 1992, there was no capital program for Fire and Rescue Services. Currently, capital equipment and space needs for fire and rescue are included in the adopted facilities standards.
4. Likewise, in 1992 there was no cost associated with Transportation Services while today park and ride lots, and bus maintenance facilities are included.
5. Schools have been consistently the largest portion of the capital facility costs. In 1992, DSAMP projected a need for 13 elementary, 4 middle and 4 high schools based on smaller student populations in each type of school. Currently the County has 4 elementary schools operating, 1 middle school and 2 high schools. The School CIP contains 4 elementary schools and 1 middle school. The Projected demand in the Upper Broad Run and Upper Foley subareas adds 10 elementary schools, 2 middle schools and 2 high schools.

School Sizes		
School	1992 students/school	2005 students/school
Elementary	750	875
Middle	1,100	1,184
High	1,350	1,600

A 37

For proffer calculation purposes, the total capital cost is translated from a per capita number into a dwelling unit figure based on the average number of people in each unit. That figure is adjusted regularly. The table below illustrates in 2005 dollars, the comparative value of the capital facilities standards.


Per Unit Capital Costs		
Units	1992 (adjusted to 2005 dollars)	2005
Detached	29,562	37,660
Attached	20,765	15,619
Multi-Family	11,215	12,611

A 38

**COUNTY OF LOUDOUN**  
**DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING**  
**MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** March 19, 1992

**TO:** Members of the *Dulles South Planning Area Citizens' Advisory Committee*

**FROM:** Edward P. Gorski, Principal Planner - Division of Comprehensive Planning 

**SUBJECT:** DULLES SOUTH PLANNING AREA CAPITAL FACILITIES IMPROVEMENTS NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND COST ANALYSIS

**BACKGROUND**

While the County may reasonably anticipate that the properties zoned as either commercial and/or employment/industrial will eventually generate sufficient revenues to pay for necessary public services and begin to have a positive impact upon the overall County budget. New housing, conversely, fails to generate sufficient tax revenue to cover the operating costs of needed public services, and invariably imposes the need to construct new or expanded capital facilities, such as schools, libraries, and recreational facilities. Loudoun has paid for these additional costs through careful financial management, bonds, property taxes and inter-governmental transfers of funds such as revenue sharing. However, there are limits to fiscal prudence, borrowing, property tax increases and grantsmanship. Loudoun County has sought in the past to share these fiscal burdens with the development community, and intends to continue this practice in the future.

Supporting private development with all the necessary public facilities and utilities will require significant expenditures. The current and projected operational funding capabilities of Loudoun County, as well as the Virginia Department of Transportation and other public agencies are and will be insufficient to provide private development with all the public facilities and utilities identified in the Choices and Changes General Plan. Unfortunately, major delays in the provision of such facilities and services would seriously hamper the marketing, sales and revenue projections of the private development sector.

Consequently, the County anticipates that the development community will cooperate with the public sector in the provision of public facilities and utilities which will be necessary to adequately service the growth anticipated within the *Dulles South Planning Area*. At the time of the adoption of the *General Plan*, it was determined, by the Board of Supervisors, that " ... (c)apital facilities costs will be determined by planning district or subarea ... " <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Choices and Changes General Plan, September 17, 1991, Chapter Two - Countywide Strategic Management, IV. Funding and Fiscal Management, B. Proffers (2), page 86.

Page Two

**DULLES SOUTH PLANNING AREA  
CAPITAL FACILITIES IMPROVEMENTS  
NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND COST ANALYSIS  
DULLES SOUTH CITIZENS' COMMITTEE 03/19/92**

Additionally, on February 4, 1992, the Board directed that the *Fiscal Impact Model* be used during the preparation of the Dulles South Area Management Plan. Based upon these Board directives and the level of development anticipated for *Dulles South* and the associated capital facilities which will be necessary, an **Initial** planning area specific assessment of the capital facilities improvements needs and an **initial** analysis of the costs associated with constructing these necessary public facilities, for the *Dulles South Planning Area* has been completed (reference **ATTACHMENT #1**).

Staff presented these **initial** estimates to the Planning Commission on Wednesday, March 18, 1992 and intends to present them to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration and endorsement as **initial build-out** input data into the *Fiscal Impact Model* for use during the preparation of the Dulles South Area Management Plan and for use in the evaluation of private sector capital facilities improvements contributions for land development proposals located within the *Dulles South Planning Area*.

Members of the Division of Comprehensive Planning will be present to discuss the elements of this analysis and answer any questions which the *Committee* members might have regarding the capital facilities needs assessment and cost analysis.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. *Dulles South Planning Area Capital Facilities Improvements Needs Assessment and Cost Analysis.*

**DULLES SOUTH PLANNING AREA**  
**CAPITAL FACILITIES IMPROVEMENTS NEEDS ASSESSMENT**  
**AND COST ANALYSIS**

Prepared by the  
Loudoun County Department of Planning  
Division of Comprehensive Planning



## **CHOICES AND CHANGES GENERAL PLAN CAPITAL FACILITIES IMPROVEMENTS CONTRIBUTIONS GUIDELINES**

While the County may reasonably anticipate that the properties zoned as either commercial and/or employment/industrial will eventually generate sufficient revenues to pay for necessary public services and begin to have a positive impact upon the overall County budget. New housing, conversely, fails to generate sufficient tax revenue to cover the operating costs of needed public services, and invariably imposes the need to construct new or expanded capital facilities, such as schools, libraries, and recreational facilities. Loudoun has paid for these additional costs through careful financial management, bonds, property taxes and inter-governmental transfers of funds such as revenue sharing. However, there are limits to fiscal prudence, borrowing, property tax increases and grantsmanship. Loudoun County has sought in the past to share these fiscal burdens with the development community, and intends to continue this practice in the future.

Supporting private development with all the necessary public facilities and utilities will require significant expenditures. The current and projected operational funding capabilities of Loudoun County, as well as the Virginia Department of Transportation and other public agencies are and will be insufficient to provide private development with all the public facilities and utilities identified in the *General Plan*. Unfortunately, major delays in the provision of such facilities and services would seriously hamper the marketing, sales and revenue projections of the private development sector. Consequently, the County anticipates that the development community will cooperate with the public sector in the provision of public facilities and utilities which will be necessary to adequately service the growth anticipated within the *Dulles South Planning Area*. At the time of the adoption of the *General Plan*, it was determined, by the Board of Supervisors, that " ... (c)apital facilities costs will be determined by planning district or subarea ... " <sup>1</sup>

The *General Plan* enunciates the following specific policies with regard to capital facilities improvements contributions: <sup>2</sup>

### **1. Capital Facilities Improvements Contributions Policies:**

- a. To assist the County in an equitable and uniform evaluation of developer proffers and other proposals for densities above 1.6 dwelling units per net acre which otherwise conform with the policies of this plan, the County anticipates developer assistance valued at 25% of capital facility costs per dwelling unit.

---

<sup>1</sup> Choices and Changes General Plan, September 17, 1991, Chapter Two - Countywide Strategic Management, IV. Funding and Fiscal Management, B. Proffers (2), page 86.

<sup>2</sup> Choices and Changes General Plan, September 17, 1991, Chapter Eight - Implementation, II. Proffer Guidelines, (A), pages 255-256.

- b. Estimated capital facilities costs per unit by unit type will be calculated by a Capital Facility Intensity Factor (CIF) based on the Fiscal Impact Model for each type of development. The CIF will be calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{CIF} = (\text{Household Size} \times \text{Facility Cost Per Capita}) + (\text{Students Per Household} \times \text{School Cost per Student})$$

- c. The following definition of "Capital Facility Proffer" will be used for the purpose of evaluating proffers:

A contribution consistent with County policies and service needs, in cash or in kind (typically land), that benefits County residents at large, which is agreed to as a condition of a rezoning. To be considered a proffer based on this definition, several criteria need to be met:

1. The facility proffered is dedicated to the County or to a local, state, federal, or regional authority or otherwise satisfies a need identified in the County's service plan or Capital Improvement Program. Dedicating facilities for the exclusive use of subdivision or group of subdivision residents does not meet this test.
2. The contribution has a quantifiable value.
3. Land is deeded to the County or to a state, federal, or regional authority.
4. The contribution would not be required under existing statutes or ordinances.
5. The proffer is irrevocable.
6. Transportation and road improvement proffers will not be included.

## CURRENT DESCRIPTION OF THE DULLES SOUTH PLANNING AREA

The *Dulles South Planning Area* covers a total of 25,100 acres (approximately 39 square miles) in the southeastern part of Loudoun County, lying both west and south of Washington Dulles International Airport. Portions of four small watersheds form the physical boundaries of Dulles South. Three of these watersheds, Cub Run, Ellick Run and Foley Branch, are part of the large Occoquan Watershed; the fourth, Upper Broad Run, is part of the Broad Run Watershed.

This large planning area includes the communities of Pleasant Valley, Arcola and Lenah as well as the Route 50 corridor east of Route 15. *Dulles South*, despite the presence of these villages, remains sparsely populated largely because it is not serviced by central water and sewer, the farmland is not rich and the soils are not well suited for the use of septic drainfields.

Approximately 600-700 families presently live in the *Dulles South* area, in a scattering of farms, large estate homes and the three small villages of Arcola, Conklin, and Lenah. The villages of Lenah and Arcola have basic commercial activities, general stores, gas stations and auto/agricultural equipment dealers. North of Route 50, Chantilly Crushed Stone operates a large quarry on the southern perimeter of Washington Dulles International Airport and two smaller quarries are located near the Bull Run or Route 659. The area is crossed by high tension power lines, running north to south as well as east to west with a major substation located on Route 705 near Bull Run. A small farm aircraft landing strip, Glascock Field, is located north of Route 50 near Arcola.

The *Dulles South* area is bisected east to west, by U.S. Route 50, which is a four-laned divided highway east of Lenah and a two-lane highway to the west. Route 659 also bisects the area north to south and extends south from Route 7 to Arcola, and continues south to Gainesville, crossing the Bull Run into Prince William County at Sudley Springs. Route 621 also crosses the area from Leesburg in the northwest to Manassas. Route 606 extends from Arcola to the northeast around the perimeter of Dulles Airport.

The area of *Dulles South*, between Braddock Road and Bull Run is generally zoned A-3, Agricultural Residential. Within a 2 mile corridor either side of Route 50, the *Dulles South* area is presently zoned R-1, Single Family Residential. There is less than 100 acres of property zoned C-1, Commercial, most of which is located in a narrow frontage along Route 50 and in the Villages of Arcola and Lenah.

## LONG RANGE PLAN FOR DULLES SOUTH

The *Choices and Changes General Plan* (*General Plan*) designates portions of *Dulles South* as appropriate for *Residential Community* type uses which **may** include such uses as single family detached, single family attached and multiple family dwelling units with densities ranging from 1.6 to 24 dwelling units per net acre (overall residential density may not exceed 4 dwelling units per net acre), public and quasi-public uses, day care facilities, and local office and retail uses of a scale and nature serving the adjoining neighborhoods.

The *General Plan* also designates portions of the planning area as appropriate for *Business Community* type uses which **may** include such uses as single family detached, single family attached and multiple family dwelling units with densities ranging from 4 to 24 dwelling units per net acre, public and quasi-public uses, local office and retail uses as well as campus style complexes consisting of administrative, business, and professional offices and research and development activities, neighborhood, community, and regional shopping centers as well as highway related commercial activities, other than shopping centers.

Finally, the *General Plan* also designates portions of the planning area as appropriate for *Industrial Community* types of uses which may include planned industrial uses, including light/flex industries, warehousing, outdoor storage, distribution uses, bulk storage of hazardous materials, and limited business uses. Diabase extractive operations and limited agricultural activities are also considered appropriate. As indicated above, supporting private development with all the necessary public facilities and utilities will require significant expenditures.

Based upon the level of development anticipated for *Dulles South* and the associated capital facilities which will be necessary, a planning area specific assessment of the capital facilities improvements needs and an analysis of the costs associated with constructing these necessary public facilities, for the *Dulles South Planning Area* appears below.

### **CAPITAL FACILITIES IMPROVEMENTS NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND COST ANALYSIS - DULLES SOUTH PLANNING AREA**

#### **A. ESTIMATED RESIDENTIAL UNIT MIX BASED UPON CHOICES AND CHANGES GENERAL PLAN: (AT BUILD-OUT):**

1.	Estimated Total Units:	44,310
a.	Estimates By Unit Types:	
1.	Single Family Detached Units:	17,724 (40%)
2.	Single Family Attached Units:	15,509 (35%)
3.	Multiple Family Units:	11,078 (25%)

#### **B. ESTIMATED POPULATION AND NUMBER OF SCHOOL AGE CHILDREN BASED UPON ABOVE REFERENCED RESIDENTIAL MIX: (AT BUILD-OUT):**

1.	Estimated Total Population:	116,094 <sup>3</sup>
a.	Estimates By Unit Type:	
1.	Single Family Detached Units:	53,526
2.	Single Family Attached Units:	40,634
3.	Multiple Family Units:	21,934

---

<sup>3</sup> Based upon 3.02 persons per single family detached household; 2.62 persons per single family attached household; and 1.98 persons per multiple family household.

- |    |   |                     |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 2. | Estimated Number of School Age Children | 19,829 <sup>4</sup> |
| a. | Estimate By Unit Type:                  |                     |
| 1. | Single Family Detached Units:           | 12,584              |
| 2. | Single Family Attached Units:           | 5,584               |
| 3. | Multiple Family Units:                  | 1,661               |

**C. NECESSARY CAPITAL FACILITIES IMPROVEMENTS IDENTIFIED AND CONSTRUCTION COSTS ESTIMATED:**

**1. EDUCATION:**

- a. Capital Facilities Improvements Identified: <sup>5</sup>
1. Thirteen (13) Elementary Schools;
  2. Four (4) Middle Schools; and
  3. Four (4) High Schools.
- b. Construction Cost Estimates Per Type of School: (expressed in terms of 1991 dollars): <sup>6</sup>
1. Elementary School: Approximately \$7,200,000.00/School.
    - a. Estimated Construction Cost for Thirteen Elementary Schools: \$93,600,000.00
  2. Middle School: Approximately \$16,870,000.00/School.
    - a. Estimated Construction Cost for Four (4) Middle Schools: \$67,480,000.00

---

<sup>4</sup> Correspondence from Gordan W. Fletcher, Jr., Director, Planning and Legislative Services, Loudoun County School Board to Edward P. Gorski, Principal Planner, Loudoun County Department of Planning, dated February 27, 1992.

<sup>5</sup> Correspondence from Gordan W. Fletcher, Jr., Director, Planning and Legislative Services, Loudoun County School Board to Edward P. Gorski, Principal Planner, Loudoun County Department of Planning, dated February 27, 1992.

<sup>6</sup> Correspondence from Gordan W. Fletcher, Jr., Director, Planning and Legislative Services, Loudoun County School Board to Edward P. Gorski, Principal Planner, Loudoun County Department of Planning, dated February 27, 1992.

3. High School: Approximately \$25,705,000.00/School.

a. Estimated Construction Cost for Four (4) High Schools: \$102,820,000.00

c. Estimated Total Education Related Construction Costs:  
\$263,900,000.00

## 2. SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT:

a. Capital Facilities Improvements Identified:

1. One (1) Resource Recovery Facility/Plant;
2. One (1) Recycling Facility;
3. Six (6) Transfer Stations; and
4. One (1) Ash Landfill (to handle burnt residue from Resource Recovery Plant).

b. Construction Cost Estimates <sup>7</sup>: (expressed in terms of 1991 dollars):

- |                                      |                 |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Resource Recovery Facility/Plant: | \$66,000,000.00 |
| 2. Recycling Facility:               | \$9,500,000.00  |
| 3. Ash Landfill:                     | \$20,000,000.00 |
| 4. Six (6) Transfer Stations:        | \$8,700,000.00  |

c. Estimated Total Solid Waste Management Related Construction Costs:  
\$104,200,000.00

## 3. RECREATION/CULTURE:

a. Capital Facilities Improvements Identified: <sup>8</sup>

1. Two (2) 200+ Acre County Parks; and
2. Three (3) Libraries (Based upon an Average of 4 Books Per Capita - Represents a Total of 464,376 Books to adequately serve *Dulles South*).

---

<sup>7</sup> Source of Cost Estimates - Solid Waste Management Association, Washington, D.C.

<sup>8</sup> It is assumed that individual land development applicants will provide on-site recreational/cultural amenities which conform to the standards contained within the adopted County Service Plans. If, however, this is not the case, the costs for providing adequate recreational and/or cultural amenities for the *Dulles South Planning Area* will be greater than indicated (reference TABLES 1 and 2).

- b. Construction Cost Estimates: (expressed in terms of 1991 dollars):
1. Two (2) 200+ Acre County Parks: \$20,000,000.00/Park<sup>9</sup>  
Estimated Parks Construction Costs: \$40,000,000.00
  2. Library: \$11,600,000.00/Library<sup>10</sup>  
Estimated Libraries Construction Costs: \$34,800,000.00
- c. Estimated Total Recreation/Culture Related Construction Costs:  
\$74,800,000.00

---

<sup>9</sup> Based upon the average cost of acquiring and developing the Claude Moore Park and the Franklin Farm Park.

<sup>10</sup> Used construction costs for the new *Eastern Loudoun Library* contained within the *Fiscal Year 1991-1995 Capital Improvements Program* as a guide.

**ADDITIONAL FACILITIES NEEDS**  
**DULLES SOUTH PLANNING AREA**

<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>COUNTY STANDARD</u>	<u>PROJECTED NEEDS</u>	<u>COST PER ACTIVITY</u>	<u>TOTAL COST</u>
Archery Range	1/5,000	23	\$5,000.00	\$115,000.00
Baseball Field (90')	1/5,000	23	\$110,000.00 (with lights)	\$2,530,000.00
Baseball Field (60')	1/5,000	23	\$80,000.00 (with lights)	\$1,840,000.00
Football Field	1/10,000	12	\$100,000.00 (with lights)	\$1,200,000.00
Golf Driving Range (40 Tee)	1/25,000	5	\$250,000.00 (with lights)	\$1,250,000.00
Picnic Tables	10/1,000	1,161	\$600.00	\$696,600.00
Picnic Shelters	1/5,000	23	\$15,000.00	\$345,000.00
Soccer Field	1/3,000	39	\$80,000.00 (with lights)	\$3,120,000.00
Softball Field	1/3,000	39	\$80,000.00 (with lights)	\$3,120,000.00
Tennis Court	1/2,000	58	\$42,000.00 (with lights)	\$2,436,000.00
Volleyball Court	1/5,000	23	\$15,000.00 (with lights)	\$345,000.00
Bike Trail	1 mi./1,000	116 miles	\$10,000/mi.	\$1,160,000.00
Hiking Trail	2mi./1,000	232 miles	\$500/mi.	\$116,000.00
Equestrian Trail	1 mi./5,000	23 miles	\$5,000/mi.	\$115,000.00
Jogging Trail	2 mi./1,000	232 miles	\$1,000/mi.	\$232,000.00
<b>GRAND TOTAL:</b>				<b>\$18,620,600.00</b>

A49

1 Based upon the standards contained within the Department of Parks and Recreation Service Plan; exclusive of two 200+ acre County Parks and three regional libraries.



**TABLE 2  
PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITY  
DEVELOPMENT COST ESTIMATES <sup>11</sup>**

<u>FACILITY</u>	<u>DEVELOPMENT COSTS (\$)</u>	<u>LIGHTING COSTS</u>
Archery Range	\$5,000	Not applicable
Baseball Field (90')	\$55,000-\$60,000	\$45,000-\$50,000
Baseball Field (60')	\$35,000-\$40,000	\$35,000-\$40,000
Basketball Court	\$15,000-\$18,000	\$5,000-\$7,000
Football Field	\$35,000-\$50,000	\$40,000-\$50,000
Golf (Driving Range - 40 Tee)	\$200,000	\$45,000-\$50,000
Picnic Tables/Grill	\$600	Not applicable
Picnic Shelter	\$11,000-\$15,000	Not applicable
Soccer Field	\$35,000-\$40,000	\$35,000-\$40,000
Softball Field (65')	\$35,000-\$40,000	\$35,000-\$40,000
Softball Field (60')	\$30,000-\$35,000	\$30,000-\$35,000
Tennis Court	\$25,000-\$32,000	\$8,000-\$10,000
Volleyball Court	\$3,000-\$5,000	\$8,000-\$10,000
Bike Trail	\$10,000/mile	Not applicable
Hiking Trail	\$500/mile	Not applicable
Equestrian Trail	\$5,000/mile	Not applicable
Jogging Trail	\$1,000/mile	Not applicable

<sup>11</sup> Source: Jay Synder, Loudoun County CIP Manager, September, 1991.

ASD

4. **HUMAN SERVICES:**

a. Capital Facilities Improvements Identified:

1. Eight (8) Community Centers: (one (1) community center per 15,000 population);
2. One (1) Senior Services Center;
3. Twelve (12) Mental Health/Mental Retardation Group Homes: (one (1) facility per 10,000 population); and
4. Two (2) Mental Health Outpatient Centers (one (1) facility per 50,000 population).

b. Construction Cost Estimates: (expressed in terms of 1991 dollars):

1.	Community Center:	\$2,045,000.00/Center <sup>12</sup>
	Estimated Construction Costs:	\$16,360,000.00
2.	Senior Service Center:	\$3,200,000.00/Center <sup>13</sup>
	Estimated Construction Costs:	\$3,200,000.00
3.	Group Home:	\$1,260,000.00/Home <sup>14</sup>
	Estimated Construction Costs:	\$15,120,000.00

---

<sup>12</sup> Cost indicated is exclusive of land acquisition costs and associated architectural/engineering fees, which are assumed obtained through developer proffers. However, if land acquisition costs and architectural/engineering fees are included, the total construction cost per community center would be approximately \$10,500,000.00; totalling \$84,000,000.00 for the construction of the necessary facilities.

<sup>13</sup> Based upon construction costs contained within the adopted *Fiscal Year 1991-1995 Capital Improvements Program*.

<sup>14</sup> Cost indicated is exclusive of land acquisition costs and associated architectural/engineering fees, which are assumed obtained through developer proffers. However, if land acquisition costs and architectural/engineering fees are included, the total construction cost per group home facility would be approximately \$2,850,000.00; totalling \$34,200,000.00 for the construction of the necessary facilities.

4. MH Outpatient Center: \$3,719,500.00/Center <sup>15</sup>  
Estimated Construction Costs: \$7,439,000.00

c. Estimated Total Human Services Construction Costs: \$42,119,000.00 <sup>16</sup>

**E. TOTAL ESTIMATED CAPITAL FACILITIES COSTS FOR THE DULLES SOUTH PLANNING AREA**

<u>CAPITAL FACILITIES CATEGORY</u>	<u>TOTAL ESTIMATED COST</u>	<u>PER CAPITA/PER PUPIL COST</u>
PUBLIC SAFETY	\$33,570,000.00	\$289.00
GENERAL GOVERNMENT	\$27,017,000.00	\$232.00
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT	\$104,200,000.00	\$898.00
RECREATION/CULTURE	\$93,420,600.00	\$805.00 <sup>17</sup>
HUMAN SERVICES	\$128,839,000.00	\$1,110.00
EDUCATION	<u>\$263,900,000.00</u>	<u>\$13,309.00</u>
<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED CAPITAL FACILITIES COSTS:</b>	<b>\$650,946,600.00 <sup>18</sup></b>	

<sup>15</sup> Based upon an average construction cost obtained from the Fiscal Year 1991-1995 CIP for constructing the Sterling and Dulles Area Mental Health Outpatient Centers.

<sup>16</sup> The total capital facilities improvements costs associated with Human Services, if land acquisition and architectural/engineering costs were included for the Community Centers and the Mental Health/Mental Retardation Group Homes would be approximately \$128,839,000.00.

<sup>17</sup> Total Recreation Facility Needs Assessment and Construction Costs Analysis; based upon the standards contained within the County's adopted Parks and Recreation Service Plan, exclusive of the cost of individual neighborhood swimming pools.

<sup>18</sup> Represents the total capital facilities improvements costs identified for the Dulles South Planning Area, as detailed within ATTACHMENT #1 of the staff report dated March 18, 1992.

F. TOTAL ESTIMATED PER UNIT CAPITAL FACILITIES COSTS FOR THE  
DULLES SOUTH PLANNING AREA

<u>TYPE OF UNIT</u>	<u>TOTAL ESTIMATED CAPITAL FACILITIES COSTS</u>
Single Family Detached	\$20,583.00 <sup>19</sup>
Single Family Attached	\$14,458.00 <sup>20</sup>
Multiple Family	\$9,396.00 <sup>21</sup>

DISK 35/DSCCATTH

---

<sup>19</sup> Based upon 3.02 persons per household and 0.79 pupils per household (as endorsed by the *Fiscal Impact Model Technical Review Committee*).

<sup>20</sup> Based upon 2.62 persons per household and 0.43 pupils per household (as endorsed by the *Fiscal Impact Model Technical Review Committee*).

<sup>21</sup> Based upon 1.98 persons per household and 0.21 pupils per household (as endorsed by the *Fiscal Impact Model Technical Review Committee*).

ATTACHMENT #1

TABLE 2: ADOPTED CAPITAL FACILITY STANDARDS

DEPARTMENT	CAPITAL FACILITY	STANDARD
Animal Care and Control	Animal Shelter	0.079 square feet per capita
Fire & Rescue	Fire & Rescue Station	1:25,000 population
Fire & Rescue	1500-gpm Engine	1:10,000 population
Fire & Rescue	ALS Ambulance	1:10,000 population
Fire & Rescue	Ladder Truck	1:25,000 population
Fire & Rescue	Heavy Rescue Squad	1:50,000 population
Fire & Rescue	Fire & Rescue Station - Western	1:10,000 population
Fire & Rescue	1500-gpm Engine - Western	1:10,000 population
Fire & Rescue	ALS Ambulance - Western	1:10,000 population
Fire & Rescue	Tanker - Western	1:10,000 population
Fire & Rescue	Brush Truck - Western	1:10,000 population
General Government	Office Space	1 square foot per capita
Health Department	Health Clinic	0.5 s.f of clinic space per #client visits
Juvenile Court Services Unit	Juvenile Probation Residence	1:250,000 population
Library Services	Library	0.6 square feet per capita
MHMRSA	MR Residential Facility	1 bed slot:5,375 population
MHMRSA	MH Residential Facility	1 bed slot:3,665 population
MHMRSA	MHSA Adolescent Treatment Ctr.	1 bed slot:237 youth 15-18
MHMRSA	MHSA Adolescent Group Home	1 bed slot:382 youth 16-17
MHMRSA	MHSA Adolescent Group Home	1 bed slot:957 youth 12-15
Office of Transportation Services	Regional Park & Ride Lot	1:25 s.m. suburban 1:100 s.m. county
Office of Transportation Services	Community Park & Ride Lot	1:4 s.m. suburban & towns
Office of Transportation Services	Bus Maintenance Facility	1:100 transit vehicles
PRCS	Recreation Center	1:75,000 population
PRCS	Regional Park	1:75,000 population
PRCS	District Park	1:25,000 population
PRCS	Community Park	1:10,000 population
PRCS	Teen Center	1:10,000 population 12-14
PRCS	Senior Center	1:10,000 population 55+
PRCS	Respite Center	1:15,000 population 55+
PRCS	Substation	1:75,000 population
Sheriff's Office	Juvenile Detention Center	#centers=x*0.0395/585
Social Services	Youth Shelter	#shelters=x*0.0116/144
Social Services	Transitional Homeless Shelter	#shelters=x*5%*3.24*19%/45
Social Services	Emergency Homeless Shelter	#shelters=x*5%*3.24*68%/190
Social Services	Juvenile Assessment Center	1:County
Social Services	Transitional Independ. Living Res.	1:250,000 population
Schools	Elementary School	875 students
Schools	Middle School	1184 students
Schools	High School	1600 students

TABLE 5 - Adopted CIF

Unit Type	Pop/ Unit	CIF/Pop	Non-School CIF	Child/ Unit	CIF/Child	School CIF	Total CIF
SFD*	3.13	\$2,527	\$7,910	0.80	\$37,187	\$29,750	\$37,660
SFA*	2.64	\$2,527	\$6,672	0.42	\$37,187	\$15,619	\$22,291
MF*	1.90	\$2,527	\$4,802	0.21	\$37,187	\$7,809	\$12,611

\* (SFD) Single Family, Detached Unit, (SFA) Single Family, Attached Unit, (MF) Multi-Family Unit.

A 54